DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 293 CS 005 668

AUTHOR Kugle, C. L.: Clements, R. O.
TITLE One Good Look Deserves Another: Combining Methodologies to Describe Classrooms. Report No. 5084.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 189p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Observation Techniques; Classroom Research; Educational Research; Elementary Education; *Reading Instruction; *Research Methodology; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods; *Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Qualitative and quantitative methodology in classroom observation were combined in this study that examined nine second grade reading classes. Each classroom was observed by an ethnographer and a classroom coder ten times throughout the year, and each observation lasted 90 minutes. For each classroom, four of the ten observations were also videotaped. The classroom observation system used was that developed by the Stanford Research Institute for use in the evaluation of the National Follow Through programs. Of particular interest in this observation system is the Five Minute Observation, which records classroom interactions in "frames" completed four times per hour. Four codes comprise each frame, indicating who performed the action, to whom it was directed, and what was done. Results indicate that some type of narrative record, or series of interviews, always be used in conjunction with categorical observation systems. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED192293

One Good Look Deserves Another:

Combining Methodologies to Describe Classrooms

C. L. Kugle & R. O. Clements

Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Report No. 5084

July 1980

CS 005668

This study was supported in part by Contracts and Grants for the National Institute of Education to The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

OCT 28 1980

One Good Look Deserves Another:
Combining Methodologies to Describe Classrooms

A previous report from this project (Malitz, Kerker, & Gainey, 1980), examined the respective strengths and weaknesses of qualitative and quantitative methodology in classroom observation. These methodologies were directly compared in a study which conducted simultaneous ethnographic and quantitative observations of nine second grade reading classes. Conclusions of the report were that quantitative observation is useful for generating inferences about classroom processes, and for providing information about the mechanics, but not the content or quality, of teaching. Content and quality can be captured by qualitative methodology, which has the limitation of being somewhat awkward and subjective for inferential use in large scale studies. It was concluded that the primary usefulness of qualitative observation lies in generating hypotheses and pilot testing quantitative instrumentation.

The purpose of the present report is to combine the data from these two methodologies in order to generate complete descriptions of the second grade reading classes which were observed, keeping in mind the limitations and strengths described above. Since there are only nine classrooms in the sample, it is not possible to make generalizations about classrooms or teaching per se. However, this process leads to hypotheses about the learning environment, and about reading instruction, which can be tested in future research.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of nine second grade classrooms in two small school districts. Four of the classrooms were in a rural district with

an ethnically mixed population; the remaining five classes were in a predominately white suburban district. Overall, the sample included students of high, medium, and low socioeconomic status. The level of experience among the teachers ranged from no previous teaching to thirteen years of experience.

The focus of observation was reading instruction. Observation began in late November, 1978, and continued throughout the rest of the school year. Each classroom was observed during reading instruction by an ethnographer and a classroom coder ten times throughout the year, and each observation lasted 90 minutes. For each classroom, four of the ten observations were also videotaped.

Observation System

The classroom observation system chosen for this study was that developed by the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) for use in the evaluation of the National Follow Through programs (Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974). This rather complex system has several sections, but of particular interest was the Five Minute Observation (FMO). The FMO records classroom interactions in "frames" completed four times per hour. Four codes comprise each frame, indicating who performed the action (teacher, child, small group, etc.), to whom it was directed (teacher, child, small group, etc.), and what was done (command, direct question, response, praise, no response, etc.). In addition, there are a number of optional modifiers which indicate whether an interaction was academic or behavioral, verbal or nonverbal, and whether the interaction could be classified as "organizing," "warmth," "punishment," or "touching." In essence, each frame is a sentence with a noun, object, verb, and optional modifiers. An FMO record, then, is a series of frames or sentences which describe interactions, and can be

thought of as a coded ethnographic record. For this reason, the FMO seemed especially appropriate for comparison with ethnographers' narrative records.

Two observer trainees received a week of intensive training from an expert SRI coder who had worked with the authors of the system. Reliability was assessed at the end of training by having the expert and the two trainees view a videotape of classroom interaction. The expert's codes were accepted as a standard, and a count was made of the number of times the trainees' "who," "to whom," "what," and "how" codes agreed with the standard. Using this method, 92.4% of one trainee's codes and 93.2% of the other's codes were found to agree with the expert's. This was considered a satisfactory level of agreement to allow the trainees to go into the field.

Generalizability theory (Cronbach, Gleser, Nanda, & Rajartnam, 1972) was used to further assess the reliability of the coders, by having them observe two classroom together. The data from these observations were used to calculate estimated reliability coefficients across coders, teachers, and observations. These coefficients were .99, .98, .94, and .99 for the "who," "to whom," "what," and "how" sections of the FMO, respectively, Thus, the data from this study appears to be quite reliable (see Malitz, et al., 1980, for an in-depth discussion of the reliability procedures used in this study).

Ethnographers

Three graduate students in the behavioral sciences were chosen as ethnographer trainees. Selection of these students was made on the basis of their displayed aptitude for accurate, sensitive, and empathetic observation as well as an ability to communicate clearly. Training was conducted over a period of four weeks by two staff members who had extensively researched classroom ethnography and who had consulted with

others involved in training ethnographers. This training procedure was described in detail by Johnson and Gardner (1979). Briefly, the training had four objectives: (1) to facilitate an understanding of the conceptual focus of the research study, (2) to establish the technique and intellectural orientation for a common ethnographic approach, (3) to instruct the ethnographers in ethnographic techniques, and (4) to establish reliability among the ethnographers. "Reliability" in the fourth objective was not strict psychometric reliability but a more informal agreement among the ethnographers concerning the scope, detail, and interpretation of observation. This was achieved by having the ethnographers observe and discuss videotape vignettes of classrooms at regular intervals.

Results

Reducing the Narrative Data

During their classroom observations, the ethnographers wrote narrative descriptions of the events which transpired as well as of their impressions and feelings about what they observed. Because these field notes were rather voluminous, it was somewhat difficult to read them and compare them with the FMO data. Therefore, during the summer following the observation phase of this study, the ethnographers were asked to use their narratives and their recollections of the teachers to write "clinical descriptions" of the teachers they had observed. These ethnographic summaries served as the qualitative data base for the current report.

Reducing the FMO Data

As mentioned previously, each FMO frame consists of a "who," "to whom," and "what" descriptor. In addition, the frame may contain a "how" modifier, as well as a code indicating whether the behavior was academic or non-academic as well as verbal or nonverbal. Because of the variety of specific

codes, a great many combinations of codes are possible. In order to reduce these numerous combinations to a form which would be readily comparable to the clinical descriptions, the following criteria were used to generate categories: (1) division of the classroom behavior into sensible units, similar to those found on other observation systems; (2) inclusion of categories which occurred with fairly high frequency in at least some of the nine classrooms; and, (3) utilization of most of the data.

The category system was a hierarchical one consisting of two levels, major categories and subcategories. Major categories were created from combinations of the "who" and "to whom" codes which occurred most often. This process thus categorized interactions according to who initiated them and to whom they were directed. The teacher-initiated categories were: Teacher-initiated individual interactions, teacher-initiated large group interactions, teacher-initiated small group interactions, and teacher non-instructional behavior. The student categories included student-initiated individual interactions, large group initiated interactions, and small group interactions. These major teacher- and student-initiated categories were further divided into a number of subcategories. This procedure categorized 94% of the total frames. It was felt that this system captured most of the major dimensions of classroom behavior and that the excluded frames were of little educational importance (such as the teacher running a record player, interacting with an aide, etc.,). However, it should be pointed out that any process which reduces a large amount of raw data to a more manageable form is necessarily going to result in loss of information. Some of this information, although of rare occurrence, may be important to the members of a particular class. The present report attempts to make note of such

events and may include discussion of categories not present in the standard profiles for every teacher.

Table 1 shows the categories resulting from the data reduction, and presents the SRI profile for one of the nine teachers. The format of these profiles is similar to one used by Stallings, Needels and Staybrook (1979). Major categories and subcategories are shown on the left side of the profile. On the far right-hand side are two sets of percentages, one pertaining to the sample of nine teachers as an aggregate, the other to the teacher of interest. The teacher categories and the student categories were treated separately in computing these percentages. For example, the value for "T initiated individ. interact. -- Total" indicates the percentage of the total teacher-initiated interactions which were directed towards an individual student. Similarly, "S initiated interaction -- total" indicates the percentage of the total student-initiated interactions which were initiated by a single student. All of these percentages were calculated separately for the sample as a whole and for the teacher of interest, and are listed under the "sample avg." and "this class" columns, respectively. The difference between these two figures indicates the degree to which the individual classroom displayed a high or low amount of the behavior, which is indicated by the "X" in the middle of the profile.

In Table 1, for example, 47.1% of Teacher 1's interactions were student-directed while the value for the sample on this behavior was 53.9%. Since Teacher 1 was relatively low on this behavior, an "X" was placed on the right side of the deviation axis to show that the teacher was approximately six percentage points below the sample average on this category. An "X" to the right of the zero point indicates a relatively high amount of the behavior, an "X" to the left indicates a relatively low amount of the behavior, and

an "X" in the middle indicates an average amount of the behavior, relative to the sample of nine teachers.

The percentages for the subcategories were computed in the same manner, except that their percentages were computed relative to their respective categories. In Table 1, it can be seen that for the sample 17.5% of the total teacher-initiated individual interactions were in the "T command or request" category, while Teacher 1 made commands or requests in 18.6% of her interactions directed toward individual students. The percentages and the deviations in percent indicate the relative number of frames involving the category, and loosely reflect the amount of time devoted to these categories. It is very important to realize that these percentages were computed in a hierarchical fashion. The major teacher categories reflect the proportion of total teacher time spent in each category, while the student categories were computed in terms of total student-initiated frames. The subcategories were then computed in terms of the total number of category frames. One can examine, for example, a teacher's behavior toward individuals as opposed to large or small groups. Likewise one can compare students' behavior in groups with their behavior as individuals. From this information, one can begin to make inferences about the ways in which teachers and students interact in various classroom contexts.

Other categorizations are available on the teacher profiles. On the bottom of the second page of each profile, all categorized interactions, whether student or teacher initiated, are broken down as academic, behavioral, or other. Academic interactions are those related to strictly academic matters (in this study, reading or spelling). Behavioral interactions indicate interactions involving behavioral corrections. Other task-oriented

interactions include non-academic interactions such as procedural interactions and incidental conversations.

Page 3 of the profile concerns affectively charged events. Because these events were rare, their occurrence was expressed in frequency rather than percent. It can be seen in Table 1 that for the sample as a whole, punishment occurred only 1.3 times out of the 10 observations, while two instances of punishment were observed for Teacher 1. The deviation graph for these events reflects the difference in frequency between the class and the sample average.

A great deal of information about these classrooms can be gleaned from each of these profiles by comparing percentages and frequencies in the various categories and subcategories. In order to see how the sample behaved as a whole, and give the procedure for comparing these categories, the sample average profile will be interpreted first.

Class Description: Sample Average

From Table 1, it can be seen that a slight majority (53.9%) of the total observed teacher time, averaged across all nine teachers, was spent in individual interaction with students. Within such individual interactions, the teachers spent 21.9% of the time asking direct questions, 17.5% giving commands or requests, and approximately 12% acknowledging student responses, and giving academic correction or guidance. It is important to note here that although this category is titled "Teacher Initiated Individual Interaction," some of the subcategories are actually responses from the teacher to a student-initiated interaction. The use of the term "initiated" is thus somewhat misleading; it is a coding term used to indicate the actor in an interaction. However, the actor may be responding to the action of a previous actor. Thus, the strategy for examining these categories should

involve a reciprocity function for teachers and students involved at the various levels of interaction. For example, when teachers ask a lot of questions, one should expect the student response category to be high; when students ask a lot of questions, the teacher response category should reflect this.

The predominant level of interaction for students was at the individual level (80%). This is not surprising since students do not typically respond at the group level unless they are reading in unison or moving to the reading area for group instruction. Within individual interactions, the primary student behaviors for all the sample classes included verbal academic responses, followed by reading aloud, questions, and nonverbal, academic responses.

The teachers, on the average, interacted with large groups of students 19.6% of the time. This type of interaction was composed of verbal instructions and explanation, direct questions, commands or requests, and observing or listening. The large groups' behavior consisted primarily of verbal and nonverbal academic responses. Small group interaction was initiated by the overall sample of teacher 11.3% of the time. Again, this level of interaction was characterized by instruction, commands or requests, direct questions, and observing or listening by the teacher, and academic responses by the students. Relatively few behavioral corrections were observed at any level of interaction. When the teacher was not involved in instruction, she was most probably engaged in paperwork; however an average of 78.2% of the observed class time was spent on academic tasks. Happy interactions were not a frequent occurrence, and when they did occur, the students initiated more of them. Few punishments or negative touches were observed overall, although the "unhappy" modifier was used to describe

the teacher's interactions an average of 15.8 times over 10 observations. These were probably behavioral reprimands. Overall, the pattern of behavior for the composite of nine teachers can generally be characterized as follows. Teachers gave instructions or explanations to the large group, (i.e., gave them seat work) and then probably conducted small group reading instruction. Within the setting of the small group, the teacher probably interacted with individual students, having them read aloud and asking them questions about the material. This pattern is a relatively traditional one for reading classes, and all of the nine teachers in this sample can be classified in the traditional mode of instruction. Individual variations on this theme show up in the teacher profiles, and will be discussed in depth later. It should be emphasized that the sample average is not an optimum for behavior, but a composite of behaviors across all of the sample classes.

At this point, the comparison process used to generate the nine classroom descriptions should be made clear. In all cases, the SRI profile was examined first, and a summary of the behaviors written. The ethnographic description for the class in question was then consulted for agreements, disagreements, discrepancies, and nonoverlapping information with the SRI profile. When examining the SRI tables, the teacher and student behaviors were compared to the sample average, and to the percentage of occurrence of the supercategory. Thus, "student questions" might be discussed in terms of how much (or little) they occurred relative to the sample average, or relative to the other categories under student initiated interaction. It was a general assumption in all these descriptions that the teachers followed a pattern similar to that described above, and that they all held to a definitional constraint of the coding system, any teacher interaction with a group composed of eight or more students was coded as a "large group"

interaction. Thus, whole class and large reading group interactions are confounded in the SRI profiles. The classes in which this occurred are pointed out in the appropriate context. Finally, it is recognized that a comparison process such as this will be subject to bias and interpretation on the part of the author. Therefore, the data from which the following descriptions are generated are included at the end of the report so that all readers may make their own judgments about the classrooms in question.

Class Description: Teacher 1

From the profile for Teacher 1 (Table 1), it can be seen that individual interactions between the teacher and students were characterized by direct questions, commands or requests and academic correction and guidance from the teacher, and academic verbal responses from the students. In addition, student questions and teacher responses compose a fair amount of the individual interactions.

Large group interactions are also dominated by teacher verbal instruction and direct questions, and academic responses on the part of the class. During small group interaction, the teacher's behavior is characterized by instruction, commands or requests, and direct questions, and the students' by verbal and nonverbal academic responses.

Compared to the sample average this teacher spends less time in individual interactions, apparently in favor of interacting with the small group. Her pattern of individual interactions was very similar to the pattern for the sample average with the exception of an elevation in teacher responses. This elevation is almost certainly due to a substantial elevation in student questions. The interesting question arises as to whether the increase in student questions is caused by the teacher or the students. The

only evidence that bears on this question is that the students in this class were high achievers suggesting that the students might be more inquisitive.

In large group interactions this teacher deviates from the sample average in verbal instructions and explanation. In fact this category accounts for almost one half of her large group interactions. On the student side the verbal and nonverbal responses predominate, expecially nonverbal responses. This suggests a pattern of teacher giving instructions and students responding by following those instructions.

This teacher spent substantially more time in small group interaction than the sample. This time was spent in instructions, explanations, and teacher guidance followed by student nonverbal academic responses.

In terms of affective tone, this class had fewer happy interactions than the sample average, and had slightly more unhappy interactions and punishment than the sample average. However, negative touches were never observed in this classroom. Overall, the profile of this class indicates a somewhat serious atmosphere, with an emphasis on academic tasks, and on individual and small group interaction.

The ethnographic description of this classroom, (Appendix A), supports the individual interaction part of this profile. The summary describes the class as characterized by "the teacher's use of individualized reading approaches and [reading] contracts, her emphasis on organization and achievement, and the extremes of reading groups present in the class," (p. 1). The ethnographer describes two reading groups in the class, one being the highest ability level in the second grade and the other being the lowest. The SRI profile does not give this information, but gives an overall impression of the class as academically orientated and on task. The summary indicates that the teacher had the students read aloud

individually and then would "ask them direct questions about the story and then inferential questions" (p. 2). With regard to the affective tone of the class, the teacher said that "she was firm with [the students] about their work," (p. 2), and the observer noted that "reading was serious," (p. 4). In addition, the teacher "was always in good control of the class," (p. 4), and was personally "reserved and very self controlled" (p. 5). The teacher and students presented a professional attitude (p. 3), and "on the whole students were always very quiet and orderly, and usually busy doing assignments" (p. 3). This corresponds with the lack of behavioral corrections observed on the SRI profile.

There is an inconsistency between the clinical description and the SRI profile. The clinical description suggests a class in which individualized instruction was heavily emphasized relative to the other teachers in the sample. While it is true that this teacher spent 47.1% of her time in individualized instruction this is 6.8% less than the sample average. This teacher spent 19% of her time in small group instruction (7.6% higher than the sample average) and yet the clinical description does not mention this as part of her instructional style. One possible explanation for this may be that there was one small group (4) of poor readers in this class. The teacher may have spent extra time with this group giving instructions and explanations. The ethnographer may have overlooked this since it was such a small proportion of the students in the classroom. The SRI profile on the other hand would nonjudgmentally present this behavior with the same emphasis as any other behavior. In addition, it is not possible to determine from the profiles presented here how much individual interaction occurred in the context of small group instruction, large group instruction, or teacher-student instruction. Thus, the majority of individual interaction in this

class may have occurred on a one-to-one basis, while in other classes, it may have occurred in a group. This information would be available in coding booklets, but is lost in tabular form.

Class Description: Teacher 2

Teacher 2's profile is shown in Table 2. This teacher initiated the same number of individual interactions as the sample average, with elevations in the number of direct questions, acknowledgements, and behavioral corrections. There are relatively few student-initiated individual interactions, but the majority of them are academic verbal responses. Reading aloud was seldom observed in this classroom. Teacher 2 appears to have interacted with large groups more than the other teachers, and these additional interactions consisted primarily of commands or requests and behavioral corrections. The modal large group response was nonverbal academic, which could consist of raising hands, getting out supplies, or responding with written work as in a spelling test. The teacher spent a small amount of time with small groups, most of which was taken up with instruction and explanation, and behavioral corrections. Few direct questions were observed during small group interaction. The small group response, like the large group response, was nonverbal academic, probably raising of hands. This teacher spent less time than the other teachers in non-instructional behaviors, but appears to engage in walking around the room. In general, nearly twice as many interactions in this classroom were behavioral as were found in the sample as a whole. Despite this fact, this teacher was observed in relatively few unhappy or negative interactions, and punishment was never observed.

The picture which emerges from this profile is of a teacher who prefers to deal with groups. With large groups, she appeared to ask many questions; students raised their hands, answered, and the teacher acknowledged

their responses. With small groups she presented information and asked relatively few questions. The students in small groups exhibited nonverbal academic behavior, probably hand-raising and supply shuffling, and verbal academic responses, probably giving answers and comments. In stark contrast with the other classrooms, reading aloud was rarely engaged in by students in this class. This teacher apparently relied upon other means, perhaps silent reading, to teach reading skills. A high amount of behavioral correction was observed with individuals, and both small and large groups. Yet the teacher never utilized punishment and was less negative than other teachers. This suggests a rather lenient teacher and a somewhat chaotic classroom.

The ethnographer's summary (Appendix B) tells us that Teacher 2 was a first year teacher, and chaos was characteristic of the classroom. "The tone of the class was almost always noisy" (p. 1) and "the students often give the impression of coordinating activity to distract from any work" (p. 3). "Basically the teacher had a hard time controlling the class," the ethnographer states (p. 4). The reason for this appears to be the teacher's lack of authority. "She does not view herself or present herself as an authority figure" (p. 4). From the ethnographer's perspective, "she acted like a normal person rather than a 'teacher' or authority figure" (p. 3). The ethnographer notes that the teacher once "expressed that she wants student to LIKE HER as well as regard her as a teacher" (p. 5). Teacher 2 tried to "personalize" rules for the students, apparently relying upon students' sense of social responsibility to guide behavior. "When someone misbehaves she personalizes their effect on the class, or on her" (p. 4). As a result, the ethnographers states, "I might characterize the relationship between teacher and student as a peer-personal one rather than a teacher-student one" (p. 4). As noted above, however, this teacher's strategy

apparently was not very effective in controlling noise and disruption. In the face of this, however, "the teacher was consistent in the tone of voice used with the students, which was generally pleasant if a bit pleading on occasion" (p. 1).

Reading aloud was seldom observed by the ethnographer, especially after the first few observations. The teacher "said that students read better and enjoyed it more when they read silently" (p. 3). Moreover, "most of the latter half of the school year was spent on phonics, spelling, work skills, etc. rather than reading per se" (p. 3). Much of the narrative is concerned with issues of teacher control of the classroom, however, some description of academic behavior is presented. "Teacher theoretically has students raise their hands but often calls on students at random" (p. 6). In addition, students "consistently" shout out answers, although they are encouraged to raise hands.

In terms of behavior control, the ethnographic summary and the teacher profile agree very well. There are many behavioral corrections, no punishment, and the teacher deals with the students in a consistently pleasant tone of voice. Academically, the teacher's de-emphasis of reading aloud is apparent in the profile. There is much hand raising, but according to the narrative raised hands are frequently superceded by calling out answers. One point in which the two data sources disagree is when the ethnographer states that "the teacher dealt with the students primarily on a one-to-one basis" (p. 1). According to the profile, there was only an average amount of teacher-initiated individual interaction, an abundance of teacher-initiated large group interaction, and a lack of student-initiated individual interactions. However, this point is never expanded upon in the narrative so it is difficult to resolve this

disagreement. In general, the narrative emphasizes control issues much more than academic issues, making it difficult to judge the accuracy of the quantitative picture of academic interaction. However, the picture of behavioral control provided by the two sets of data is clearly in agreement.

Class Description: Teacher 3

From the interaction profile for Teacher 3, (Figure 3), it can be seen that this class did not differ much from the sample average in terms of time spent in individual, large group, or small group interaction. However, the type of interaction observed has some striking differences. For example, students rarely read aloud individually, but they read aloud in unison in small groups five times more often than the sample average. When the teacher was engaged with small groups, she gave mostly commands or requests, gave no acknowledgements and made few behavioral corrections. Slightly more behavioral corrections on the individual level were observed for this teacher, perhaps indicating a fair amount of classroom monitoring on her part. Individual interactions between teacher and students consisted primarily of direct questions from the teacher, academic verbal responses and questions from the students, and acknowledgements, responses, and academic guidance from the teacher. Large group interactions were dominated by teacher instruction and explanation, nonverbal academic responses from the students, and an elevated amount of choral responses from the class. Fewer happy interactions were observed in this class and slightly more unhappy interactions and punishments were recorded. The percentage of time spent on academic and behavioral interactions was higher in this class as well, indicating a somewhat serious, task-oriented atmosphere.

From these observations, one might infer that this teacher gives explanations and instructions to the whole class which responds in chorus and by getting to work. The teacher then conducts instruction in small groups by having the students read aloud in unison, by asking direct questions about the material, and then by acknowledging the students responses, or giving them academic guidance. The rest of individual interactions are characterized by student questions, probably about the material presented or work to be done, and teacher responses. Finally, individual behavioral corrections occur slightly more than the sample average, possibly indicating that the teacher monitors the class during small group instruction to keep disruptions to a minimum.

These inferences are given life by the ethnographic description of Teacher 3's classroom. As stated on page 7 of Appendix C, "teacher 03's classroom exemplifies the old-fashioned business virtues of efficiency, careful methodical work, conformity, quiet, lack of spontaneity, and product orientation." The routine of reading period was consistent: the teacher would pass out worksheets to the whole class and have "students read the instruction, clarify them, and do examples, bit by bit," (p. 2). After following this procedure for several worksheets, the students would begin working quietly and the teacher would call the first reading group, a small, lower-ability group, to the reading semicircle. The observer reports "She kept them for 10 or 15 minutes, doing workbook or worksheet activities involving word recognition and some phonics. Sometimes they read the story silently and answered comprehension questions. I never saw them read aloud" (p. 7), (emphases added).

The second group of students was large and homogeneous (many came in for reading from other classes while many of Teacher 03's homeroom

students went to other teachers). This large group was split into two groups for work at the reading circle, but the instruction they received was the same. When they first entered the classroom, the teacher would review the lesson with them all, then take each group in turn at the reading area. "There they might answer questions about the story; go over vocabulary words; have additional lessons in phonics, word meanings and sentence structures; read aloud; and get further assignments," (p. 8). Reading aloud in this case consisted of choral reading; the teacher "feels it keeps them from getting as bored as they would listening to others read, and it helps them 'build speed'," (p. 6). This same procedure was followed for the other half of this group; the teacher would then meet with the lower-ability group a second time to grade their work and give them a new assignment.

As reflected in the SRI profile, the teacher's strategy for dealing with individual questions was parallel to that for giving instruction to the whole class: "She would have the student read the instructions, ask him or her a few general questions, and then ask for the specific application that had prompted the student's questions. This method was very effective for getting students to handle their own problems, to find the answer without being told straight out," (p. 9).

The use of acknowledgement of student's responses is also noted in the classroom description: "She does not praise. It is as though correct responses are only to be expected," (p. 1); "She was minimally responsive with either praise or criticism," (p. 8). Vague answers from the students elicited "accepting and guiding" phrases from the teacher (p. 5).

During reading groups, the teacher would monitor and control students who got too noisy (p. 3). Students who needed help would usually wait until

the ongoing reading group was dismissed. The observer characterizes Teacher 3 as having "uncanny" control of the classroom, describing the activities as tightly organized and smooth running (p. 10). Finally, "Her reprimands were moralistic: Not the force of her personality or authority, but rather appeals to right and wrong, were brought to bear on the deviants" (p. 10). Thus, the behavioral corrections which appeared in the SRI profile were most likely made before the deviance became a disruption; in this way control was maintained rather than re-established.

Class Description: Teacher 4

Based on inferences from the SRI profile given in Table 4, it seems that the classroom activities of Teacher 04 follow a pattern somewhat similar to many of the reading classes described thus far. To the class as a whole, the teacher gave verbal instructions and explanations, along with direct questions. The group responded with either nonverbal academic behaviors (getting to work), or verbal academic behavior (answering the teacher's questions). The teacher spent most of her time dealing with individual students, asking direct questions, and giving either acknowledgements or academic guidance. The vast majority of student interactions were on the individual level as well, and consisted primarily of academic verbal responses. Relatively few interactions involved the teacher with a small group. Since no academic corrections were observed at the small group level, it appears that this teacher spent most of her instructional time dealing with individual students, or with the class as a whole. This teacher spent less time in non-instructional activities than the sample average, and the majority was spent engaged in paperwork. In terms of affect, the students initiated many more happy interactions than the sample, in spite of the fact that the teacher initiated many more unhappy interactions than

the sample. It is possible that this teacher presented a somewhat gruff manner, but was actually nonthreatening to and liked by the students.

The ethnographic description of Teacher 4 supports the general thrust of these inferences, but indicates that this did not follow closely the pattern of other reading classes. "This teacher has a very tight schedule for reading because her students are all 'off level'...Because they are behind, and/or deemed to have 'problems,' many are enrolled in special programs (Title I, 'resource,' speech, and bilingual education) that meet during the reading period...Her work on reading in the classroom must be planned around their diverse schedules..." (p. 2). There are three "groups" in the class, but actually one has only three students, one has two, and the remainder of the class constitutes the third group. The teacher typically would work with the three-member group first, which was composed of the poorest readers in the second grade. The interaction with these students can be characterized as individualized, even though it occurred in a group context. The larger group met next, but always worked from their seats since the round table used for the small group was not sufficient to accomodate them. The last group to meet was composed of two students, who did the same work as the first group but had to be treated independently due to their participation in the bilingual program. This pattern of activity accounts for the profile in Table 4 that indicates the teacher dealt primarily with individual students, or with the whole class, but not with small groups. Finally, the observer states that when..."Her formal instructions to the group as a whole are over...She walks from student to student, responding to raised hands and checking on those whom she expects to have trouble" (p. 7).

With regard to the evelated number of student initiated happy interactions, the observer notes that "the teacher allowed, even encouraged,

talking" during instruction. These were often personal comments (p. 4) which presumably were intended to keep the students involved in the story and vocabulary words (p. 10). "The more gregarious [students]...speak out and relate personal experiences that the story reminds them of," (p. 7). However, the description notes that the teacher "was not skilled at tying the students' comments together or following up on student leads to teach something new or make a point. Transitions between 'talking' and 'working' were usually abrupt," (p. 10). The elevated number of teacher behaviors coded as negative were apparently due to the teacher's impatience and stern manner during instruction. Examples of this demeanor are given throughout the narrative: the teacher becomes increasingly irritated at a student's inability to find the right answer (p. 1-2); she is annoyed when a student drops a personal object and it clatters (p. 5); she "snaps back" at a student who failed to turn in his workbook and then wonders why it wasn't graded (p. 6); she speaks sternly to a student who is off-task (p. 7), and so on. A quote from the ethnographer's description of Teacher 4 offers insight into the affective tone of this classroom: "This teacher saw herself as very demanding, both in terms of academics and discipline. She felt that she was very strict, but she also joked with students (though sometimes at their expense) and claimed to like them and to enjoy teaching. From my observations, she was the kind of teacher who could be fun if you were on her good side, but horrible if you crossed her. Sometimes she seemed moody and almost arbitrary in her reactions to students, but there was a sort of wierd internal logic to her responses. Her rules were clear, even if her reaction (or over-reactions) to infractions were not always predictable. Usually it was obvious what you had to do to please her, but some students were incapable or unwilling, and class must have been a trial for them at times," (p. 12).

Class Description: Teacher 5

Teacher 5 had approximately the same amount of individual interaction as the sample average, but the type of interaction differed. For example, the teacher asked fewer direct questions and gave more responses, instructions or explanations, task-related comments, and behavioral correction or guidance. This indicates that individual students probably asked a lot of questions, which is confirmed by the profile in Table 5. In addition, the students had slightly fewer academic responses than the sample average, and slightly more behavioral responses--a pattern reflective of the teacher's profile for individual interaction.

In terms of large group interaction, the teacher spent considerably more time observing or listening than the sample average and considerably less time asking direct questions. Instruction and explanation was the modal teacher behavior; again, an elevated amount of behavioral corrections were recorded. The majority of responses to the large group were academic, but many more behavioral responses occurred than in the overall sample.

With small groups, the teacher engaged in twice as much instruction or explanation as the sample average. Consistent with her pattern of behavior thus far, she asked fewer direct questions, and commands or requests than the sample. She exhibited no acknowledgements in a small group context, and few or no acknowledgements in any of the other contexts. The small group gave predominately academic responses, and no instances of reading aloud in unison was recorded.

Several inferences can be drawn from this pattern of interaction. For example, the fact that the students asked a lot of questions, and the teacher spent a lot of time explaining, indicates that the students had difficulty following instructions, and/or demanded individual attention.

In addition, this pattern possibly implies that the teacher allowed interruption of small group instruction to deal with individual questions from outside the group. The elevated number of behavioral corrections supports the idea of interrupted instruction and indicates that the students tended to get noisy, and/or off-task. In spite of the large number of behavioral interactions, the relationship between the teacher and the students does not seem to be emotionally charged, as indicated by the low number of affective codes for this classroom.

The descriptive profile for this teacher indicates that during instructions to the class about their morning assignments there is "much questioning, speaking out, and conversations between students" (p. 1). After passing out the worksheets, the teacher goes from student to student stapling the worksheets and making comments. "When she is near, students speak out to show her their work and ask questions," (p. 2). The narrative continues: "The teacher goes to her desk and begins filling out the attendance report. Several students come up with questions, and she stops to deal with each. One students sits at his desk with his hand raised, and the teacher gets up and goes to him. Her proximity seems to generate more questions, and she goes from table to table, helping students who speak out or raise their hands" (p. 2).

Twenty-six students are in this class for reading: eight of them are in a high-ability group; the remaining 18 students are at the "low average" reading level and are divided into two equivalent groups for reading instruction. The observer notes that Teacher 5 had a somewhat variable pattern of instruction for reading, but had two general rules she followed: she tried to give enough work to the students to keep them busy while she had a group in the reading area, and she always called her slightly slower

of the "low average" groups to the reading area last. She spent a longer time with this group but, this was "partly because the teacher was more likely to be distracted by outside interruptions that prolonged the session. On the average, the teacher had to correct or reprimand students in other groups about five times during each session with Close Encounters and only three times per session with the Little Rascals" (p. 10). The observer notes, however, "all the reading groups were exposed to fairly frequent interruptions," (p. 10). These were composed of reprimands to talkers, and "the other students' persistence in asking the teacher questions about their work while she was 'in a group'" (p. 11).

In terms of affective tone, the description of Teacher 5 is peppered with observations of her neutral style: her voice is "conversational though businesslike" (p. 1); to a personal comment from the student, "she merely nods and makes a noncommittal remark" (p. 2); she calls down disruptive students "matter of factly without real anger or personal vindictiveness" (p. 8). "She seldom seemed angry. More often, she seemed irritated, but her annoyance dissipated quickly. It was commonplace for students to be lectured, reprimanded several times during a period, moved to isolated spots, or even sent into the hall. It happened so often that both teacher and students seemed to look upon it as a matter of course. The teacher nagged, the students grumbled, but nobody really seemed too upset" (p. 10).

There is a discrepancy between the SRI profile of Teacher 5 and the ethnographic description. On pages 7 and 8 of the narrative, Teacher 5 has her low average groups read in unison during their respective turns at the reading circle. This is not reflected in the SRI profile where one would expect it: small group reading aloud. However, since these groups

are composed of more than eight students each, the behavior in question should be coded as a large group interaction: large group reading aloud. This category does not appear in Table 5 because it was a casualty of the process which converted the actual codes to tabular form. This type of discrepancy points out the value of using narrative data in conjunction with coded observations, especially when encountering the "loss of information" situation inherent to data reduction.

Class Description: Teacher 6

Teacher 6 spent less time interacting with individual students than the sample average. These interactions were composed of commands or requests, verbal instruction, teacher responses, and direct questions. Less academic guidance was observed and slightly fewer behavioral corrections occurred than in the overall sample. Individual student behavior was characterized by questions, verbal and nonverbal academic responses, and reading aloud. The teacher spent more time in large group interaction than the sample average, and her modal behaviors were instruction and explanation, commands or requests, direct questions, and observing or listening. However, compared to the sample average, Teacher 6 spent a smaller percentage of her interaction with the whole class instructing or explaining, and a larger percentage observing or listening, and giving nonverbal instructions. The pupils' responses, in the large group context, are consistent with the teacher behaviors--academic verbal and nonverbal responses.

To small groups of students, Teacher 6 spent more time asking direct questions and acknowledging student responses than the sample, and less time instructing and observing the students than the sample. The majority response from the small group was academic and verbal, with a smaller proportion of nonverbal responses.

In terms of non-instructional behavior, Teacher 6 spent more time walking aroung the room--possibly monitoring the class as her percentage of time "observing or listening" would indicate. Teacher 6 initiated more happy interactions than the sample average, while the students initiated slightly fewer happy interactions than the sample. Fewer unhappy interactions were initiated by Teacher 6 than the sample and she was never observed to punish a student.

The profile that emerges from their observations is of a teacher who prefers to deal with the class as a whole rather than individual students, and who probably monitors the class while they are working. The lack of behavioral corrections for this class could mean that the students stayed on-task most of the time, or that the teacher had a higher tolerance for off-task behavior then the rest of the teachers in the sample. Perhaps the monitoring behavior kept student activities controlled so that behavioral corrections were not needed. These speculations require the information contained in the ethnographic profile for confirmation or rejection.

On page 1 of this profile, the field observer notes that Teacher 6 had previously taught fifth grade, and was "not used to second grade students and hadn't realized their dependence on teacher direction...A major problem area in her instructional area, according to her, was her lack of experience planning for small reading groups. Previously she had taught using large group techniques for homogeneous classes of students." The teacher characterized her teaching style "as a balance of skills instruction and monitoring of independent activity," (p. 2).

The description also states that Teacher 6 worked with the small groups for lengthy periods of time, listening to them read and asking comprehension questions (p. 4). This is coded under "large group interaction" on the

SRI profile since two of the groups in this class has eight or more students. Thus the "observing and listening" behaviors of this teacher were probably in a reading group context, and were not monitoring activities, as previously inferred.

In fact, the observer describes this classroom as chaotic (p. 6). "Teacher 06 tolerated a wider variety of student behavior than other teachers on the team...She tried to ignore inappropriate behavior and praise appropriate actions," (p. 3). In addition, "There were no clear cut rules in the classroom. It was difficult to tell whether students needed permission to leave their seats or whether students expected consequences for not completing work," (p. 3). The lack of rules in this class may have been due to the teacher's inexperience with second graders, who need more structure than older students. And the lack of behavioral corrections noted in the SRI profile was apparently due to the teacher's tolerance of the students' actions and her practice of ignoring off-task behavior, and not to the control-through-monitoring pattern suggested by Table 6. However, it should be pointed out that the "work load for students seemed somewhat less than in other classes so usually students were able to finish work quickly," (p. 3). In this situation, without clear rules for alternative activities once work is finished, it is difficult to know what the teacher considered off-task behavior.

Class Description: Teacher 7

In this class, the teacher spent half of her observed time in individual interactions, which is consistent with the sample average. Of these interactions, the majority was spent asking direct questions or giving commands or requests. The teacher gave more acknowledgements to student responses than the sample, and fewer verbal explanations or

instructions. Few behavioral corrections were observed. Students' actions were characterized by verbal academic responses and reading aloud. Fewer questions and behavioral responses were observed for individual students in this class than for the sample.

During large group interaction the teacher again asked a lot of direct questions, and gave fewer instructions than the sample average. Slightly more of her time was spent observing or listening than that recorded for the sample, and slightly more behavioral corrections were observed in this context. Large group responses were predominately academic and verbal, with an elevation of behavioral and choral responses at this level of interaction.

A good proportion of time was spent in small groups, during which the teacher exhibited the same pattern of asking more direct questions, and giving fewer instructions and explanations than the sample. More teacher time was spent observing or listening, and less was spent giving behavioral guidance than the sample average. Small group response was predominately academic, either verbal or nonverbal, and very little choral reading was observed.

The emotional climate of this class appeared to be happy, judging by the number of student and teacher interactions modified by the "happy" code. Fewer unhappy interactions were initiated by the teacher in this class than for the overall sample.

In general, it appears that this class spent a lot of time on task--the percentage of academic interactions was higher for this class than for the sample. Few behavioral corrections were observed, and very little time was spent instructing or explaining directions. Since the students did not ask many questions, perhaps the students' work was posted on the board so that the teacher did not have to spend a great deal of time giving verbal instructions. Teacher-student interactions consisted of direct questions from the teacher

and responses from the student. Individual students got to read aloud more in this class than in the sample. Finally, the affective tone of this class was positive, indicating that students were probably enjoying their work.

The class profile written by the field observer confirms most of these inferences. This reading class is composed of the high ability students in the second grade (p. 1), and the teacher's instructional style emphasizes student independence (p. 2). In addition, "The teacher would write reading assignments by group on the blackboard in the front of the room," (p. 2). Each day the teacher would begin class with an explanation of the directions and work for each group. During this time the students would do choral readings of the directions, which explains the elevation of "large group choral response" on the SRI profile.

Small group instruction followed the general, and individual group, assignments. This consisted primarily of oral reading and comprehension questions (p. 3). The reading class schedule and order of reading groups rarely changed throughout the year (p. 4). The observer notes that the students always knew what to expect in this class and rules for behavior were explicit, e.g., not interrupting the teacher during reading group (p. 4).

As indicated in Table 7, behavioral corrections are given in generalities and to the group as a whole (p. 5). The teacher's tone was usually "business-like but pleasant," (p. 5). "There was a sense of independence and friendliness in the classroom," (p. 6). "Students were actively involved in class activities. They appeared to enjoy their work. They cheered when they finished a reader... There was little competition between students," (p. 7). The observer describes the teacher as having high expectations for her students (p. 8), exercising high control over classroom activities, and having low tolerance for interruptions (p. 9). Thus, the impression generated by the classroom profile

profile in Table 7 of industrious, happily-working students is confirmed by the field observer's description.

Class Description: Teacher 8

Looking at Teacher 8's profile (Table 8), one notices that there is more individual interaction in this classroom than in the sample as a whole. Both the teacher-initiated and student-initiated individual interactions were higher than average. During individual interactions, this teacher engaged in many commands or requests, nonverbal explanations, and had a relatively high amount of academic correction and guidance. Student response consisted primarily of reading aloud and academic verbal responses. With large groups, this teacher engaged in an above-average amount of direct questioning and relatively little lecturing (verbal instruction or explanation). Large group responses were not especially frequent in this classroom. Small group interactions, both teacher- and student-initiated, were relatively infrequent. This teacher seemed to avoid small group instruction or explanation, relying more upon commands, requests, and direct questions to individual students. During the periods of observation, the small groups were never observed doing choral reading.

Turning to non-instructional behavior, it can be seen that this teacher spent a great deal of time relative to the other teachers walking around the room, and less time doing paperwork (such as grading papers). Of its total interactions, this classroom had a slightly below average amount of academic interactions. Among the affective categories, this teacher engaged in a remarkable number of unhappy or negative interactions relative to the other teachers. In addition, slightly fewer than average student-initiated happy interaction were observed.

Putting these data together, one may infer that this teacher prefers to interact with individuals rather than groups. Within the reading groups, she prefers to have individuals read aloud and does not request group or choral reading. She engages in much academic correction, perhaps correcting students as they read aloud. The frequent use of commands or requests of individuals may be a result of frequently asking students to read aloud. When students are engaged in seatwork, this teacher seems to do a lot of walking around, probably checking on individual students and going over workbook material (nonverbal instruction and explanation). On the whole, some academic time may be taken away by matters of procedure and transition, although behavioral disruptions do not seem to be a problem. Nevertheless, relative to other teachers, a great number of the teacher's utterances are negative, and few of the pupils initiate happy interactions. Thus, there may be a rather somber, punitive atmosphere in this classroom.

Turning to the ethnographer's summary, many of the statements above are confirmed. This teacher places "considerable empahsis on practicing oral reading" (p. 3); and "reading group usually entails students reading aloud individually" (p. 9). As students read aloud, the teacher "will usually help a student who stumbles on a word by giving them the word" (p. 9). This is the sort of individual academic correction which emerged on the profile. The daily routine for this teacher involved giving students instructions for their morning assignments which contributed to the relatively high amount of procedural interactions noted on the profile. During seatwork activities, the teacher walked around the room checking work. Much individual interaction occurred during this time since the teacher would typically hand back graded papers "with praise or critical

comments" (p. 7). It is because of these activities that this teacher's profile showed a high amount of individual interaction.

One rather striking aspect of the ethnographer's summary is the number of comments regarding the teacher's stern demeanor. Reference is made to this teacher's "stern teaching style" (p. 3), "characterized by firmness and a no-nonsense approach" (p. 3). Teacher 8 "has a tendency to jump on children for small violations of informal rules" (p. 4), "her tone of voice is often critical and exasperated or irritated" (p. 4), "she will often grab a child roughly by the arm when they are misbehaving" (p. 4), her use of punishment is rated "high" (p. 11), and "she rarely appears pleased with anything" (p. 11). Reading class is described as "a very businesslike time" with "an atmosphere which is somewhat formal and considerably demanding of student conformance to teacher rules" (p. 10). This teacher's negative tone was reflected on the profile by the high number of unhappy or negative teacher interactions (nearly three times the sample average). In addition, there was more punishment and negative touching observed in this classroom as well as fewer student-initiated happy interaction.

Thus, for this classroom, both the SRI profile and the ethnographic summary gave similar pictures of Classroom 8, reflecting a great deal of reading aloud, much individual interaction, negative affect, and a pattern of moving around the room to supervise students with their seatwork.

Class Description: Teacher 9

Slightly fewer individual interactions were observed in this classroom. Of these, the predominate activity was commands or requests, with other behaviors--direct questions, responses, verbal and nonverbal instructions, and task-related comments--fairly evenly distributed. Fewer acknowledgements, praise, academic and behavioral corrections were observed for this teacher

than for the sample. Student individual responses were characterized by questions, and academic verbal and nonverbal responses. Slightly more large group interaction was observed for this class than for the sample, with more nonverbal instruction and less verbal instruction than that for the sample. The predominant large group response was academic and verbal, with a higher percentage of choral responding than seen in other classes.

During small group instruction, the teacher gave commands or requests, asked direct questions, and acknowledged responses. More behavioral corrections were observed for small groups in this class than for the sample average. Small group responses were predominantly verbal and academic.

During non-instructional time, the teacher was engaged in paperwork and spent almost no time walking around the room. On the whole, slightly less time was spent on academic activities in this class. The atmosphere of this class was somewhat somber and punitive, judging from the few happy interactions that were observed, and the relatively high number of punishments and negative touches.

In general, it appears that this teacher preferred to deal with large groups, rather than individuals, or small groups. She spent more time using nonverbal instruction than the sample--perhaps pointing to directions on the board or to specific tasks in workbooks or readers. Individual students had more nonverbal responses--perhaps getting out their materials, or moving around the classroom at the teacher's direction. Students read aloud about the same amount in this class as in others; small group instruction possibly consisted of oral reading, followed by questions from the teacher, responses from the students, and acknowledgements from the teacher. When the teacher was not involved in instruction, she was engaged in paperwork. As indicated above, the affective tone of the class was negative.

The description of Class 9 by the ethnographic observer indicates that the first part of reading was composed of spelling work, during which the whole class would participate (p. 4). After directions were given and oral questions were answered, students would work on their assignments, while the teacher (and an aide) walked around the class checking work and helping individual students.

After spelling, and a short break, students would receive "seatwork" directions by reading group (p. 5). While students were engaged in completing these assignments, the teacher would conduct small group instruction. This consisted primarily of individual oral reading followed by questions from the teacher's guide about the material read (p. 5).

With regard to the affective tone of the class, the ethnographic description does not indicate that this is an especially somber class or that the teacher is negative toward the students. "There is a low key and orderly tone prevading this reading class...[The teacher's] voice is very non-committal when disciplining students...When students talk too much or stand out as disruptive they may be warned once. If they continue they are told to stand in the corner near the file cabinet or are directed to change their seat," (p. 6). However, the observer also notes that "it is clear from the teacher's tone of voice and her follow-through on warnings that she will not tolerate unappropriate behaviors," (p. 6). Further, "... she does not encourage very much personal discussion [from the students]... Her tone is friendly but formal and somewhat distant from the students," (p. 9). It seems that the lack of personal comments from the students, the teacher's firm stand on inappropriate behavior, and her use of actual "punishment" in the form of having disruptive students move to another part

of the classroom, resulted in an SRI profile that looked negative relative to the other classes.

Discussion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the classroom descriptions presented here. These conclusions concern both the classrooms themselves and the comparison process which produced the descriptions. With regard to the classrooms, it is possible to make some inferences about student activities and learning from the information given. For example, in Teacher 1's class, where reading is a serious activity, and students stay on task most of the time, one would expect high reading achievement and low disruptiveness from the students. In addition, these students should have fairly high self-esteem with regard to school activities, and might also exhibit a fair degree of performance anxiety. However, such pupil measures are confounded by the fact that Teacher 1 had the highest ability second grade readers in the whole school. It seems fair to ask whether these students, if placed in a class somewhat more chaotic than Teacher 1's, where reading was less serious and businesslike, would not exhibit the same characteristics on the variables mentioned above simply because of their entering ability level and attitude toward school. The same argument can be applied to all nine of the teachers in this sample. In all cases the students were homogeneously grouped by ability for reading class; within the classes the students were again homogeneously grouped for small group instruction. Thus the ability to predict teacher-learner interactions is limited by the nature and number of the reading classes in this study. However, with these limitations in mind, a few tentative descriptive relationships have been postulated and are presented in Table 10.

At the left side of this table are several characteristics of the class which are salient to achievement, disruptiveness, and student self-esteem. The achievement measure consisted of reading percentile scores on the standardized achievement test given at the end of the school year. Ratings of disruptive behavior were made on all the students by the teacher (labeled T-DIS) and the ethnographic observer (labeled O-DIS). These ratings could range from one (considerably below average disruptiveness) to five (considerably above average disruptiveness). In general, the observer tended to rate the students as more disruptive than the teachers. This was probably due to the difference of opinion between the teacher and the observer regarding the average (3) disruptiveness rating. Many more students were rated as average on this attribute by the observer than by the teachers, who tended to give their students below average ratings. Self-esteem of the students was measured using the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (Piers & Harris, 1969), an 80-item questionnaire orally administered to the students in small groups. High self-esteem is indicated by higher value scores, the possible range being from 0 to 80. As indicated in Table 10, most groups score fairly high in this instrument. The school self-esteem measure is composed of one of the cluster scores on this instrument. Values can range from 0 to 17 on this measure, with higher scores indicating higher self-esteem for school-related behaviors. Sample averages for all these indices are presented to the right of the table, for comparison purposes.

The expected outcomes were generated from information given in the SRI profiles, and the clinical descriptions. For some teachers, for example, who had high control of their class, kept students on-task, and had high ability students, predictions about expected outcomes were easy to make. For others, either less clear teaching patterns, or incomplete information

in the ethnographic descriptions made the expected outcomes harder to generate. In these cases, the ability level of the students, combined with the amount of time spent on academic tasks, was the major deciding factor. For example, it was assumed that high ability students would not be as adversely affected by low time on task than low ability students. This procedure did not always result in accurate predictions, as indicated in Table 10.

Finally, a few comments on the use of quantitative and qualitative methodologies to describe classrooms are in order. First, it appears that when the SRI profile presented a clear pattern of teacher behavior, this pattern was generally confirmed by the clinical description provided by the ethnographer. When the pattern was less clear, the ethnographic description contributed a great deal toward understanding the teaching activities reflected in the SRI codes. In addition, narrative data such as used in this study are invaluable in explicating the instructional style of the teacher, the noise level of the class, the teacher's tolerance for misbehavior, and a variety of other details not provided by categorical coding. In this study, the ethnographic observations were supplemented with interviews with the teacher, which provided information on the teacher's expectations for the students, the ability level of the class, the teacher's instructional style and beliefs about teaching reading, and much additional knowledge that could not be gained otherwise. It is the recommendation of this report that some type of narrative record, or series of interviews, always be used in conjunction with categorical observation systems. Only in this way can the skeleton of teacher-student interactions provided by the codes be given life and meaning.

References

Cronbach, L. J., Gleser, G. C., Nanda, H., & Rajaratnam, N. The dependability of behavioral measurements. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972.

Johnson, N. K., & Gardner, C. H. Toward a prototype for training classroom ethnographers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Malitz, D., Kerker, R. M., and Gainey, L. M. Integrating quantitative and ethnographic methods to describe the classroom. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Piers, E. V., & Harris, D. B. Manual for the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings & Tests, 1969.

Stallings, J. A., & Kaskowitz, D. H. Follow Through classroom observation evaluation, 1972-73. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.

Stallings, J., Needels, M., & Staybrook, N. How to change the process of teaching basic reading skills in secondary schools: Phase II and phase III. Menlo Park, California: SRI International, 1979.

TABLE 1

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 01

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE (<2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> / <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>)	SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL		53.9	47.1
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		17.5	18.6
T DIRECT QUESTION		21.9	19.9
T RESPONSE		9.2	13.5
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL		9.1	7.2
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL		3.2	.4
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		4.1	5.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		12.9	10.4
T PRAISE		2.3	2.4
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC		12.3	14.1
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		4.5	4.3
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		3.1	4.8
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL		88.5	78.1
S QUESTIONS		12.7	20.2
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		49.5	47.9
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		11.4	11.2
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE		3.7	3.8
S READING ALOUD		17.8	13.2
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW		4.9	3.8
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL		19.6	19.6
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		19.3	13.4
T DIRECT QUESTION		19.6	17.8
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL		34.4	47.9
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL		1.9	0.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		2.8	1.7
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		1.9	0.0
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		3.8	6.1
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		17.1	13.9

TABLE 1

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 01

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE -----LESS FREQ------AVG------MORE FREQ----- <2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	10.8	9.4
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	48.6	43.4
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	42.8	55.7
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	4.6	.9
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.	X	4.0	0.0
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	11.3	19.0
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	26.3	23.2
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	25.4	19.0
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION	X	31.1	37.2
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT	X	2.5	0.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	2.1	6.7
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	2.4	.4
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	10.2	13.4
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	8.7	12.5
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	48.1	33.6
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	45.5	66.4
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD	X	6.3	0.0
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV. -- TOTAL	X	15.2	10.4
T WALKING AROUND ROOM	X	9.9	10.9
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK	X	90.1	89.1
TOTAL INTERACTIONS	X	100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC	X	78.2	80.8
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	2.8
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED	X	18.1	16.4

TABLE 1

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 01

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: -----LESS FREQ------AVG------MORE FREQ----- <2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> / <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	FREQUENCY: THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS	X	4.0	2.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS	X	8.1	3.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.	X	15.4	16.0
PUNISHMENT	X	1.3	2.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)	X	1.8	0.0

TABLE 2

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 02 (PAGE 1 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: <2 <0	1 1 5	1 0	0 0 5	0 0	0 5	1 0	1 5	2> 0>	PERCENT: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL					X					53.9	53.1
T COMMAND OR REQUEST					X					17.5	14.7
T DIRECT QUESTION						X				21.9	26.1
T RESPONSE					X					9.2	9.9
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL					X					9.1	7.1
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL				X						3.2	0.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS					X					4.1	4.2
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS						X				12.9	17.9
T PRAISE					X					2.3	4.1
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC				X						12.3	7.9
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL						X				4.5	7.5
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING					X					3.1	.7
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL				X						80.5	76.3
S QUESTIONS						X				12.7	16.9
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC								X		49.5	66.0
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC				X						11.4	6.0
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE					X					3.7	4.7
S READING ALOUD		X								17.8	.7
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW					X					4.9	5.7
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL							X			19.6	31.7
T COMMAND OR REQUEST						X				19.3	24.6
T DIRECT QUESTION				X						19.6	15.5
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL					X					34.4	34.5
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL					X					1.9	1.1
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS					X					2.0	3.0
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS					X					1.9	0.0
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL						X				3.8	8.1
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING				X						17.1	13.2

TABLE 2

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 02

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE -----LESS FREQ------AVG------MORE FREQ----- <2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL		10.8	19.5
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC		48.6	38.5
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		42.8	58.1
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE		4.6	3.4
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.		4.0	0.0
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL		11.3	7.7
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		26.3	26.8
T DIRECT QUESTION		25.4	9.4
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION		31.1	47.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT		2.5	0.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC		2.1	0.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		2.4	14.5
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		10.2	2.2
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT. -- TOTAL		8.7	4.2
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		48.1	43.8
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		45.5	56.3
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD		6.3	0.0
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV. -- TOTAL		15.2	7.6
T WALKING AROUND ROOM		9.9	15.4
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK		90.1	84.6
TOTAL INTERACTIONS		100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC		78.2	77.2
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL		3.8	7.7
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED		18.1	15.1

TABLE 2

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 02

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2 <0	1 1 5	1 0	0 5	AVG 0 0	0 5	MORE FREQ 1 0	1 5	2> 0>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS					X					4.0	4.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS					X					8.1	10.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.			X							15.8	5.0
PUNISHMENT				X						1.3	0.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)					X					1.8	3.0

TABLE 3

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 03

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE <2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL		53.9	57.0
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		17.5	13.9
T DIRECT QUESTION		21.9	22.9
T RESPONSE		9.2	10.0
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL		9.1	8.9
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL		3.2	2.1
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		4.1	3.5
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		12.9	16.4
T PRAISE		2.3	1.5
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC		12.3	11.5
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		4.5	6.1
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		3.1	3.3
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL		80.5	78.1
S QUESTIONS		12.7	16.6
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		49.5	56.4
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		11.4	9.5
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE		3.7	3.8
S READING ALOUD		17.8	7.8
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW		4.9	5.9
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL		19.6	18.8
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		19.3	20.3
T DIRECT QUESTION		19.6	19.5
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL		34.4	44.8
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL		1.9	.2
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		2.0	.7
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		1.9	.8
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		3.8	3.3
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		17.1	10.4

TABLE 3

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 03 (PAGE 2 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: <-2	-1.5	-1.0	-0.5	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	>2.0	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT. -- TOTAL					X					10.8	10.4
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC			X							48.6	35.8
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC						X				42.8	46.8
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE				X						4.6	1.7
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.							X			4.0	15.6
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL					X					11.3	11.5
T COMMAND OR REQUEST							X			26.3	38.7
T DIRECT QUESTION				X						25.4	22.3
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION				X						31.1	26.6
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT					X					2.5	0.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC					X					2.1	1.9
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL					X					2.4	.5
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING					X					18.2	9.9
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT. -- TOTAL						X				8.7	11.5
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X									48.1	16.7
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC							X			45.5	52.6
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD									X	6.3	30.7
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV. -- TOTAL					X					15.2	12.7
T WALKING AROUND ROOM				X						9.9	4.6
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK						X				90.1	95.4
TOTAL INTERACTIONS					X					100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC						X				78.2	83.4
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL					X					3.8	4.1
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED				X						18.1	12.5

TABLE 3

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 03 (PAGE 3 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2	1 1	1 0	0 0	0 0	0 1	1 1	1 2>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
	<0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0>	
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS				X					4.0	2.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS			X						8.1	3.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.				X					15.8	16.0
PUNISHMENT				X					1.3	2.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)				X					1.8	1.0

TABLE 4

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 04 (PAGE 1 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ / AVG / MORE FREQ (<2, 1 5, 1 0, 0 5, 0 0, 0 5, 1 0, 1 5, 2 0>)	SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL		53.9	67.7
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		17.5	10.9
T DIRECT QUESTION		21.9	27.7
T RESPONSE		9.2	5.9
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL		9.1	10.0
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL		3.2	1.1
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		4.1	2.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		12.9	17.0
T PRAISE		2.3	2.6
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC		12.3	14.9
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		4.5	2.6
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		3.1	5.2
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL		80.5	91.4
S QUESTIONS		12.7	8.9
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		49.5	59.6
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		11.4	7.4
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE		3.7	2.1
S READING ALOUD		17.8	14.9
S NO RESPONSE OR DON*T KNOW		4.9	7.1
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL		19.6	10.6
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		19.3	15.1
T DIRECT QUESTION		19.6	21.0
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL		34.4	51.3
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL		1.9	0.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		2.0	1.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		1.9	1.2
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		3.8	1.8
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		17.1	8.5

TABLE 4

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 04

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE <2 <1 <0 1 5 1 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 1 5 1 0 2> 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	10.8	5.5
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.6	37.4
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	42.8	54.2
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	4.6	4.7
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.	X	4.0	3.7
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	11.3	5.8
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	26.3	25.3
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	25.4	25.8
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION	X	31.1	33.3
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT	X	2.5	.4
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	2.1	0.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	2.4	1.3
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	10.2	13.8
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	8.7	3.2
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.1	46.8
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	45.5	53.2
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD	X	6.3	0.0
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV. -- TOTAL	X	15.2	11.8
T WALKING ARDUND ROOM	X	9.9	11.0
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK	X	90.1	89.0
TOTAL INTERACTIONS	X	100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC	X	78.2	81.3
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	2.3
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED	X	18.1	16.4

TABLE 4

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER #4

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2 <0	1 5	1 0	AVG 0 5	0 0	0 5	MORE FREQ 1 0	1 5	2> 0>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS						X				4.0	7.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS									X	8.1	29.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.							X			15.8	25.0
PUNISHMENT				X						1.3	1.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)				X						1.8	0.0

TABLE 5

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 05 (PAGE 1 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: <-2	-1.5	-1.0	-0.5	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	>2.0	PERCENT: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL					X					53.9	54.5
T COMMAND OR REQUEST				X						17.5	14.1
T DIRECT QUESTION			X							21.9	14.3
T RESPONSE						X				9.2	13.1
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL						X				9.1	13.9
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL					X					3.2	.3
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS						X				4.1	7.6
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS					X					12.9	10.7
T PRAISE						X				2.3	3.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC					X					12.3	10.8
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL						X				4.5	9.3
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING						X				3.1	2.8
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL							X			80.5	88.5
S QUESTIONS							X			12.7	22.6
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC				X						49.5	44.8
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC				X						11.4	7.1
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE						X				3.7	7.5
S READING ALOUD					X					17.8	15.6
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW					X					4.9	2.5
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL				X						19.6	12.9
T COMMAND OR REQUEST				X						19.3	13.7
T DIRECT QUESTION			X							19.6	8.0
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL						X				34.4	38.1
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL					X					1.9	3.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS					X					2.0	1.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS					X					1.9	0.0
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL						X				3.8	7.2
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING									X	17.1	31.9

TABLE 5

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 05

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE LESS FREQ — AVG — MORE FREQ <2 <0 | 1 5 | 1 0 | 0 5 | 0 0 | 0 5 | 1 0 | 1 5 | 2> 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	10.8	5.1
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.6	44.8
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	42.8	44.8
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	4.6	10.3
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.	X	4.0	0.0
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	11.3	13.1
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	26.3	17.8
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	25.4	15.2
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION	X	31.1	60.9
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT	X	2.5	0.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	2.1	.3
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	2.4	3.4
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	10.2	2.4
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	8.7	6.3
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	48.1	47.2
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	45.5	52.8
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD	X	6.3	0.0
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV. -- TOTAL	X	15.2	19.5
T WALKING AROUND ROOM	X	9.9	5.8
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK	X	90.1	94.2
TOTAL INTERACTIONS	X	100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC	X	78.2	69.8
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	8.0
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED	X	18.1	22.1

TABLE 5

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 05

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2 <0	1 5	1 0	0 5	AVG 0 0	0 5	MORE FREQ 1 0	1 5	2> 0>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS				X						4.0	1.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS					X					8.1	9.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.				X						15.8	10.0
PUNISHMENT					X					1.3	0.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)					X					1.8	1.0

TABLE 6

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 06 (PAGE 1 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ / AVG / MORE FREQ (<20 … <05 … <00 … 05> … 10> … 15> … 20>)	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	53.9	41.8
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	17.5	21.0
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	21.9	19.5
T RESPONSE	X	9.2	16.1
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL	X	9.1	12.8
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL	X	3.2	3.6
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS	X	4.1	4.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	X	12.9	9.7
T PRAISE	X	2.3	2.5
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	12.3	5.8
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	4.5	2.5
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	3.1	2.3
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL	X	80.5	66.3
S QUESTIONS	X	12.7	19.1
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC	X	49.5	39.1
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC	X	11.4	17.0
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	3.7	2.7
S READING ALOUD	X	17.8	19.6
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW	X	4.9	2.4
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	19.6	30.6
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	19.3	22.2
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	19.6	18.8
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL	X	34.4	25.3
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL	X	1.9	4.1
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS	X	2.0	2.0
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	X	1.9	2.3
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	1.4
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	17.1	23.9

TABLE 6

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 06

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE <2 | 1 5 | 1 0 | 0 5 | 0 0 | 0 5 | 1 0 | 1 5 | 2> <0 | | | | | | | | 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL		10.8	18.5
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		48.6	50.2
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		42.8	45.7
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE		4.6	3.7
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.		4.0	.4
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL		11.3	11.6
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		26.3	27.9
T DIRECT QUESTION		25.4	36.3
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION		31.1	20.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT		2.5	9.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC		2.1	1.2
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		2.4	1.2
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		10.2	4.4
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL		8.7	15.2
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		48.1	66.4
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		45.5	29.5
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD		6.3	4.1
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV. -- TOTAL		15.2	16.0
T WALKING AROUND ROOM		9.9	14.8
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK		90.1	85.2
TOTAL INTERACTIONS		100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC		78.2	76.8
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL		3.8	2.8
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED		18.1	22.8

TABLE 6

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 06 (PAGE 3 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: <2 SD, 1.5 SD, 1 SD, 0.5 SD, AVG, 0.5 SD, 1 SD, 1.5 SD, 2> SD	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	FREQUENCY: THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS		4.0	8.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS		8.1	5.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.		15.8	7.0
PUNISHMENT		1.3	0.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)		1.8	1.0

TABLE 7

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 07

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE (<2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> / <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>)	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	53.9	50.0
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	17.5	21.2
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	21.9	37.7
T RESPONSE	X	9.2	5.4
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL	X	9.1	2.7
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL	X	3.2	.4
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS	X	4.1	4.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	X	12.9	15.8
T PRAISE	X	2.3	1.6
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	12.3	8.6
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	4.5	1.9
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	3.1	.6
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL	X	80.5	79.3
S QUESTIONS	X	12.7	5.6
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC	X	49.5	49.2
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC	X	11.4	13.5
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	3.7	1.8
S READING ALOUD	X	17.8	21.4
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW	X	4.9	8.6
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	19.6	12.3
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	19.3	16.5
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	19.6	29.0
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL	X	34.4	18.8
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL	X	1.9	0.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS	X	2.8	5.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	X	1.9	3.4
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	5.1
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	17.1	22.2

TABLE 7

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 07

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: <2 <0	1 5	1 0	0 5	0 0	0 5	1 0	1 5	2> 0>	PERCENT: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL					X					10.8	8.2
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC							X			48.6	56.5
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC		X								42.8	25.4
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE							X			4.6	12.3
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.						X				4.8	5.8
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT, -- TOTAL							X			11.3	20.1
T COMMAND OR REQUEST					X					26.3	22.4
T DIRECT QUESTION							X			25.4	33.7
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION			X							31.1	20.7
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT					X					2.5	3.0
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC					X					2.1	2.1
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL					X					2.4	1.2
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING						X				10.2	16.9
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL						X				8.7	12.6
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC							X			48.1	56.1
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC					X					45.5	42.0
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD				X						6.3	1.9
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV, -- TOTAL						X				15.2	17.6
T WALKING AROUND ROOM			X							9.9	3.4
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK						X				90.1	96.6
TOTAL INTERACTIONS					X					100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC						X				78.2	84.4
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL					X					3.8	2.1
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED				X						18.1	13.5

TABLE 7

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 07 (PAGE 3 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2 <0	1 1 5	1 0 5	AVG 0 0	0 0 5	MORE FREQ 1 1 0	1 1 5	2> 0>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS					X				4.0	8.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS				X					8.1	10.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.			X						15.8	8.0
PUNISHMENT				X					1.3	1.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)				X					1.0	1.0

TABLE 8

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 08 (PAGE 1 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE (<2 <0 | 1 5 | 1 0 | 0 5 | 0 0 | 0 5 | 1 0 | 1 5 | 2> 0>)	SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL		53.9	58.0
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		17.5	24.6
T DIRECT QUESTION		21.9	13.7
T RESPONSE		9.2	4.2
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- VERBAL		9.1	6.1
T INSTRUCT., EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL		3.2	9.6
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		4.1	2.9
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		12.9	8.8
T PRAISE		2.3	1.9
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC		12.3	21.2
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		4.5	4.4
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		3.1	2.4
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL		80.5	84.5
S QUESTIONS		12.7	4.3
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		49.5	44.8
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC		11.4	12.3
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE		3.7	3.9
S READING ALOUD		17.8	32.5
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW		4.9	2.3
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL		19.6	17.6
T COMMAND OR REQUEST		19.3	22.0
T DIRECT QUESTION		19.6	25.7
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- VERBAL		34.4	26.7
T INSTRUCT., EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL		1.9	0.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS		2.0	.5
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		1.9	3.8
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL		3.8	2.8
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING		17.1	18.4

TABLE 8

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 08

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE -----LESS FREQ------AVG------MORE FREQ----- <2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	10.8	9.5
LG. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.6	52.5
LG. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	42.8	41.0
LG. GRP. BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	4.6	6.0
LG. GRP. CHORAL RESP.	X	4.0	.5
T INIT. SMALL GROUP INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	11.3	7.9
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	26.3	32.8
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	25.4	29.5
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION	X	31.1	14.6
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT	X	2.5	4.5
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	2.1	1.9
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	2.4	4.1
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	10.2	12.7
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	9.7	5.9
SM. GRP. VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.1	51.1
SM. GRP. NONVERBAL RESP. -- ACADEMIC	X	45.5	48.9
SM. GRP. READING ALOUD	X	6.3	0.0
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV, -- TOTAL	X	15.2	16.5
T WALKING AROUND ROOM	X	9.9	25.9
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK	X	90.1	74.1
TOTAL INTERACTIONS	X	100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC	X	78.2	75.8
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	3.7
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED	X	18.1	20.5

TABLE 8

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 08

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2 <0	1 1 5	1 0	0 5	AVG 0 0	0 5	MORE FREQ 1 0	1 5	2> 0>	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS				X						4.0	3.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS			X							8.1	3.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.									X	15.8	42.0
PUNISHMENT				X						1.3	3.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)					X					1.8	5.0

TABLE 9

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 09 (PAGE 1 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE -----LESS FREQ------AVG------MORE FREQ----- <2 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 2> <0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
T INITIATED INDIVID. INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	53.9	49.3
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	17.5	22.3
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	21.9	14.5
T RESPONSE	X	9.2	10.6
T INSTRUCT.. EXPLANATION -- VERBAL	X	9.1	12.1
T INSTRUCT.. EXPLANATION -- NONVERBAL	X	3.2	10.0
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS	X	4.1	5.6
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	X	12.9	7.2
T PRAISE	X	2.3	1.6
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	12.3	8.3
T CORRECT. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	4.5	3.8
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	3.1	4.1
S INITIATED INTERACTIONS -- TOTAL	X	80.5	74.8
S QUESTIONS	X	12.7	15.2
S VERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC	X	49.5	38.1
S NONVERBAL RESPONSE -- ACADEMIC	X	11.4	19.2
S BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	3.7	5.1
S READING ALOUD	X	17.8	17.2
S NO RESPONSE OR DON'T KNOW	X	4.9	5.2
T INIT. LARGE GROUP INTERACT. -- TOTAL	X	19.6	24.7
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	19.3	19.8
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	19.6	21.1
T INSTRUCT.. EXPLAN. -- VERBAL	X	34.4	26.4
T INSTRUCT.. EXPLAN. -- NONVERBAL	X	1.9	7.6
T TASK RELATED COMMENTS	X	2.0	3.9
T ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	X	1.9	4.3
T CORRECTS. OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	2.3
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	17.1	14.6

TABLE 9

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 09 (PAGE 2 OF 3)

VARIABLE NAME	PERCENT DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE LESS FREQ — AVG — MORE FREQ <2 <0 | 1 5 | 1 0 | 0 5 | 0 0 | 0 5 | 1 0 | 1 5 | 2> 0>	PERCENT SAMPLE AVG.	PERCENT THIS CLASS
LARGE GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	10.8	17.7
LG, GRP, VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.6	62.7
LG, GRP, NONVERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	42.8	27.1
LG, GRP, BEHAVIORAL RESPONSE	X	4.6	3.0
LG, GRP, CHORAL RESP,	X	4.0	7.2
T INIT, SMALL GROUP INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	11.3	7.1
T COMMAND OR REQUEST	X	26.3	27.1
T DIRECT QUESTION	X	25.4	27.6
T INSTRUCTION OR EXPLANATION	X	31.1	26.1
T ACKNOWLEDGMENT	X	2.5	7.0
T CORRECT, OR GUIDANCE -- ACADEMIC	X	2.1	1.0
T CORRECT, OR GUIDANCE -- BEHAVIORAL	X	2.4	4.0
T OBSERVING OR LISTENING	X	10.2	7.0
SMALL GROUP INITIATED INTERACT, -- TOTAL	X	8.7	7.6
SM, GRP, VERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	48.1	70.3
SM, GRP, NONVERBAL RESP, -- ACADEMIC	X	45.5	27.7
SM, GRP, READING ALOUD	X	6.3	2.0
T NON-INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAV, -- TOTAL	X	15.2	19.0
T WALKING AROUND ROOM	X	9.9	.6
T ENGAGED IN PAPERWORK	X	90.1	99.4
TOTAL INTERACTIONS	X	100.0	100.0
TOTAL ACADEMIC	X	78.2	72.8
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL	X	3.8	3.5
TOTAL OTHER TASK-ORIENTED	X	18.1	23.7

TABLE 9

INTERACTION PROFILE FOR TEACHER 09

VARIABLE NAME	DEVIATION FROM SAMPLE AVERAGE: LESS FREQ <2 / <1.5 / <1.0 / <0.5	AVG / 0.0	MORE FREQ >0.5 / >1.0 / >1.5 / >2.0	FREQUENCY: SAMPLE AVG.	FREQUENCY: THIS CLASS
T INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS		X		4.0	1.0
S INIT. HAPPY INTERACTIONS		X		8.1	1.0
T INIT. UNHAPPY OR NEG. INTERACT.		X		15.8	13.0
PUNISHMENT		X		1.3	3.0
TOUCH (NEGATIVE)		X		1.8	4.0

Table 10

Tchr. No.	Characteristics of Class	Pupil Measures	Expected Values	Actual Values	Sample Average	Sample Variance
1	Reading was serious High student engagement Few behavioral corrections Task orientation High ability students	Achievement T-Disruptiveness O-Disruptiveness Total Self-Esteem School Self-Esteem	High Low Low High High	81 1.5 3.0 63.0 13.0	56 2.3 2.8 59.4 11.8	23.5 .7 .4 3.8 .9
2	Reading, per se, not stressed Moderate student engagement Many behavioral corrections Low teacher control Low-average ability students	Achievement T-Disruptiveness O-Disruptiveness Total Self-Esteem School Self-Esteem	Moderate Low High High Moderate	60 2.8 3.4 65.2 12.6	56 2.3 2.8 59.4 11.8	23.5 .7 .4 3.8 .9
3	Skill-oriented reading High student engagement Monitoring behavioral corrections High teacher control High-average to low ability students	Achievement T-Disruptiveness O-Disruptiveness Total Self-Esteem School Self-Esteem	High Low Low High High	72 NA 2.9 61.9 12.0	56 2.3 2.8 59.4 11.8	23.5 .7 .4 3.8 .9
4	Emphasis on phonics Variable student engagement Teacher-dominated discussions Disruptive behavioral corrections Low-ability students	Achievement T-Disruptiveness O-Disruptiveness Total Self-Esteem School Self-Esteem	Low Low Moderate Moderate Moderate to Low	40 1.3 2.8 60 11.6	56 2.3 2.8 59.4 11.8	23.5 .7 .4 3.8 .9

Table 10--Continued

Tchr. No.	Characteristics of Class	Pupil Measures	Expected Values	Actual Values	Sample Average	Sample Variance
5	Skill-oriented reading (not for fun) Many student questions Much off-task behavior, group interruptions Neutral behavioral corrections High and low-average ability students	Achievement	Moderate to High	80	56	23.5
		T-Disruptiveness	Moderate	NA	2.3	.7
		O-Disruptiveness	Moderate to High	2.7	2.8	.4
		Total Self-Esteem	Moderate	59.8	59.4	3.8
		School Self-Esteem	Moderate to High	11.1	11.8	.9
6	Variable reading schedule Low student engagement Ignoring of misbehavior Low expectations of students High-average students	Achievement	Moderate to Low	52	56	23.5
		T-Disruptiveness	Low	2.4	2.3	.7
		O-Disruptiveness	High	2.8	2.8	.4
		Total Self-Esteem	Moderate	58.6	59.4	3.8
		School Self-Esteem	Moderate to Low	11.1	11.8	.9
7	Consistent reading schedule High student engagement Few behavioral corrections High teacher control High-ability students	Achievement	High	77	56	23.5
		T-Disruptiveness	Low	2.1	2.3	.7
		O-Disruptiveness	Low	2.1	2.8	.4
		Total Self-Esteem	High	58.7	59.4	3.8
		School Self-Esteem	High	12.9	11.8	.9
8	Emphasis on oral reading Moderate student engagement Stern behavioral corrections Many academic corrections Low-ability students	Achievement	Low	17	56	23.5
		T-Disruptiveness	Moderate	3.1	2.3	.7
		O-Disruptiveness	Moderate to High	.3	2.8	.4
		Total Self-Esteem	Moderate	53.8	59.4	3.8
		School Self-Esteem	Moderate to Low	10.6	11.8	.9

Table 10--Continued

Tchr. No.	Characteristics of Class	Pupil Measures	Expected Values	Actual Values	Sample Average	Sample Variance
9	Oral reading and questions Moderate student engagement Monitoring behavioral corrections Individualized prompting techniques Low-average students	Achievement	Moderate	29	56	23.5
		T-Disruptiveness	Low	2.9	2.3	.7
		O-Disruptiveness	Low	2.4	2.8	.4
		Total Self-Esteem	Moderate	53.8	59.4	3.8
		School Self-Esteem	Moderate to High	11.0	11.8	.9

CLINICAL DESCRIPTION T 01

This class may be characterized by the teacher's use of individualized reading approaches and contracts, her emphasis on organization and achievement, and the extremes of reading groups present in the reading class.

Teacher 01 has a corner room in the section of the school containing the second grade rooms. It has only one main entrance, though there is another doorway in the corner shared by all of the second grade rooms. The corner room allows her some privacy and quiet that is not available to Wilkensen (T 02). T 01 has changed the room around a number of times throughout the observation session, including arranging desks together to make tables and the traditional single desk in rows facing front. Room arrangement seems to be a matter of novelty more than any organizational strategy. T 01 displays student art work (and at the end of one observation gave the students free time and helped some of her home room students complete art projects). There is a calandar and monthly events buliten board, a number of cupboard, one on the far side of the room containing supplimentary reading books, creative writing boxes, and art supplies. There is a listening table to review reading skills on one side of the room, a table with books from the library, an empty table that the teacher uses for reading groups, and a coat rack on one wall. Students found the tables convenient for 'partner reading'--they would disappear in twos and threes underneath to read aloud to one another.

The reading class consists of two groups, 17 in one, and 4 in the other (numbers varied over the observation period as students were moved in the school). The larger group was the highest reading level in all the second grade (of 8 levels). The Teacher characterized them as high achievers, aware of their abilities, and under some pressure to perform from the school, their parents, and the teacher herself. She said that she would consider some of them 'gifted'. In general they were reading on 3rd, 4th, and 5th, grade levels. The smaller group, on the other hand, were the lowest readers in the second grade. They had been originally assigned to Wilkensen (T 02) but that would have given her 3 groups and Moroney only 1 (must be that the Administration thought that Moroney only needed one with those high students). Moroney volunteered to take the low group, in part because she felt that the example or implicit competition between the two groups might encourage the low group, and in part because she thought that the high group could help the low group and learn from them as well. This, in reality, didn't work as the high group quickly became bored or frustrated with the low group and "would give them the answers" So, Moroney separated the two groups and left it that way. The high group is so aware of its status that there is little natural mingling of the two groups in any case. The teacher herself uses different strategies with each group, and expresses different attitudes to each as she assessed their abilities.

T 01

When the observations began in November, T 01 working with students on an individualized basis in the high group, and in a reding circle in the low group. With the high group she would contract with them for covering a certain amount of work in one week, assessing the quality of that work, or thier progress, when she read with them. At the beginning of the class she would remind students to check the contract on the wall (the weeks cnntract was posted on the wall and would list what should be covered by whom, when) so that are doing what they should be doing for the day and she does not have to remind them individually. (SEE METHODS, ROUTINE, IN INTERVIEW NOTES). Students would come up to read, pulling up a chair so that they were side by side with the teacher. They would read aloud, and them she would take the book and ask them direct questions about the story and then inferential questions. If the student seemed stumped by something she would help them solve the problem by suggesting a way that they might approach it (go to the library and look up things on reptiles to someone with reptiles in the story, or look in up in the dictionary and then find out more about it and tell me what you found). She would allow the students individual responsibility for completion of work and exploration of new material. Most students seemed used to this approach and understood what was expected of them. If anything they were almost too self directed. The teacher said that she was firm with them about their work, had high expectations of them, (often they would cry if they did not meet her expectations interview 5/15), and would give them a U if they did not complete work (which did not happen often) after a warning. For second graders they were almost compulsive. After Christmas, this system changed somewhat in that because of administrative demands for a structure that was closer to that of the other teachers in the school, she began to take reading and skills in small groups while maintaining much of the contract orientation as before.

The system of teaching used for reading by the teacher is based on Guzak's individualized reading program which deals with different levels of skill in one individual. The teacher had used this system in Taylor where she had all reading levels present in the same class. The Administration was afraid that the students would be too advanced for third grade once they moved on and that the third grade teachers would not be able to cope with them. Another problem concerned the use of books. Originally the teacher was using some of the books that would be used in 3rd or 4th grade. Guzak requires a wide range of reading material and is best utilized if it is material that the teacher is familiar with rather than library books. The Administration solved this problem by finding books that were no longer being used by the school system as supplimentary readers. Another problem concerned the goals presented by the administration and parents as regards the abilitiesof the students. Basically they wanted the teacher to modify her methods to match those of other teachers while teaching a near enrichment program. They wanted the students to be worked to their ability levels.

One strong characteristic of this classroom (in contrast to T 02) was the noise level. On the whole students were always very quiet and orderly, and usually busy doing assignments. Those who were disruptive (Shaun, Kevin) were noted for personality problems and were generally ignored by the other students. The attitude presented by both teacher and students was one of professionalism The students presented a fairly consistent performance as students, especially the girls. I was struck by the competition and academic activity and coordination of the girls in the class. They would act together as a group (especially Robin, Cheryl, Paula, Jennifer) in organizing academic activities. Males usually acted alone. While I did not see too much overt favoritism from the teacher to girls, it was usually girls (Robin in particular) who did extra tasks around the classroom like picking up papers, etc. On the whole, everyone seemed to know what they were doing and did it on their own.

The small group consisted of usually 4 students. The original 4 were Susie, Virginia, Brian, and Rageef. Susie at some point was sent to resourch, and Virginia, later, moved on to another higher level. For the second half of the year the group consisted of Brian, Rageef, Judy, and Catherine (SEE STUDENT DESCRIPTIONS). Most of these students could not read when the year started. The teacher described Brian and Catherine as possibly minimal brain damaged with learning disabilities, Judy as ahving home problems (she was Chicano), and Regeef as at a disadvantage due to a year in India. His written skills were good but he had difficulty reading. The teacher said that all these students needed special attention and structured the content of the group to reflex their basic disabilities. She would take special pains to explain things slowly (and would actually speak more slowly to this group) and to have them complete one exercise or lesson befor moving on to another. Virginia, before she was moved to the other group, quickly became a leader of this group and would instruct, or boss, the others as to what, or how fast they should be working. Brian and Catherine formed an affiliation where Brian, at least, would perform for Catherine. Judy tended to be almost overly enthusiastic about doing things, and the teacher would have to get her to slow down before she would be able to absorb the material. Judy was very anxious to learn. I wasn't sure if part of this was an effort to please the teacher or a natual approach, but the teacher did consider her the student with the most potential of the group (interview 5/15) and did consistantly give her more attention. Rageef probably received the least attention. Despite his reading problems, I would view him as the last vunerable of them all. The teacher was often impatient with Brian and would express that impatience in her tone of voice (especially when Brian would come to her desk to ask a question--more so than in group sessions), and in her mannerisms. She was careful with Catherine, who often seemed timid and easily scared. With Catherine, she would speak very slowly and clearly and give her more time to reply than was usual with the others.

While both groups were aware of one another, they did not interact much. The teacher said that she felt this natural in that kids of the same intellect tended to recognize one another and stick together. This sounded to me a bit like recognition of abilities was given high priority and value at the school and by the teacher and was manifested in the behavior of the students. The small group sat in one corner of the room together. The only

T o01

I would note as having much to do with the small group was Shaun, who like them was a kind of an outcast from the larger group.

The teacher was somewhere around 30, married with a few children. She had taugh for 4 or 5 years at Taylor before moving to Deepwood. At Taylor she taught by Guzak methods. This was her first year at Deepwood. At Taylor she said that she had taught 4th grade, all levels, and that while she had high kids here, she tended to often treat them as if they were older than they were, forgetting that they were only 2nd graders. Their precociousness didn't help that tendency. Her major concern was that she was expecting too much of them (See INTERVIEW notes). In the classroom she was very controlled, with little personality fluctuations. She seems to had the system of contract/individualized reading structured to run with very little supervision or major modification, though from the nature of it it must include a lot of outside work on her part. The organization of the class and the professional demeanor of the teacher seem to contribute to a sense of reading as a special academic pursuit (I don't have any other class she teaches to compare reading to so I cannot say if this is a norm) It would seem logical that given that they were the high group, and this was a 'special' approach, i.e. individualized contracts which no other teacher in the second grade used, the reading class in itself would become something special. This seemed to be expressed to me in the actions of the teacher and the students in the high group--that they saw themselves and their method as different and special. Reading was serious. There seemed to be a marked emphasis on behaviors appropriate to a learning context and a non learning context, i.e. professional or academic behaviors and personal behaviors. In terms of a professional role the teacher as an authority figure modeled how to be a student and how to approach material. This modeling seemed evident Crause in the behaviors of the girls in the class in particular. Conntexted to this but extending to the personal realm was the necessity of cultivating a sense of personal responsibility for work and consideration of others in the classroom. The teacher felt that many of these children came from prividledged backgrounds and had to be reminded on basic civilities, like 'tank you'. The teacher would switch from a professional, or teacher, to a person in interaction with students, and these switches were fairly well defined in terms of activities (this in contrast to T 02 who always operated on a personal level of interaction). The teachers ability to interact with students personally (these moments were often very pleasant re. Jennifer and her drawing book narrative , or conversation about filling out forms and returning them narrative) gave her the ability to have affect on their behaviors, form affiliations with them, while her professional behaviors set limits and commanded respect. The teacher was always in good control of the class. Her view of herself never seemed to question her ability to handle the material or the students, even Shaun, or Kevin, who were behavior problems. In the teacher interview she said that Shaun was given to her because the open structure of the class would be good for him and because she could handle him.

T 01

The teacher's expectations of the students included working up to their ability, laarning to pace themselves, be goal orientated--get 'E's, to be aware of procedure--contracts and be personally responsible for their own work, and to be aware of themselves as performers--to know their abilities and perform well. During class she would permit student behaviors such as interrupting another group to ask questions (though she usually tried to clear the deck before taking a group, and often with the small group would announce that she did not want to be interrupted), leaving the room to go to the library or to the bathroom, though this varied somewhat given the student, and in certain contexts, to call out answers. The usual case was to raise their hands, or to wait quietly when interrupting for her to acknowledge them. She didn't usually have to remind them of proper behavior as this seldom got taken advantage of except by those who already had some problems, in which case she would make a correcting or disparaging remard like Shaun, not now, sit down at your seat and I'll talk to you when I'm finished, ignore it, or let peer presure control it. She seemed to take it on herself to keep the contract system going, provide enough work, deal with individual characters and problems, and attempt to be clear about what had to be learned (whether she always was was hard to say). She always appeared to be.

When I first started observing this class, I thought the teacher's manner to be cold, authoritarian, and hard hearted. As the observations continued, she began to be less so (this was obviously modified by her interactions with me and seeing more of her in the class), yet her class is distinguished for me by the differnece in her manner when teaching and when teaching is over. She is in both cases reserved and very self controled. Though, when the administration tried to alter her program too radically, she was very expressive and almost in tears telling me about it (interview 1). Her concern was expressed in terms of the needs of the children, and I believe that to be honest. She does however, have high expectations of herself and her performance (though this is more performance in terms of organization and content rather than affect and content) and has similar expectations of her students. There is, however, at times a near sterility to the classroom. Things just seem too much in hand.

Her favorite students seemed to me to be Chrissy, Robin, Cheryl, Judy, Jennifer (later), Matt, Steven, though on the teacher interviews she lists Matt, Merideth, Scott, K'Lynn, Jill Manuel, Judy, Paula, Cheryl, Christi, Kevin, Lori, Tiffany, Katherine, and Andrew all as Most desirable for her class. Steven, Billy, Christi K., Lyle, Robin, and Brian all got middle marks. Michelle, and Rageef got checked between low and middle and Sean and Jennifer got checks on low. T had said that there was a personality problem with Jennifer and while she tried to reinforce her (be firm) she must have continued to be a problem (Jennifer was the child crying at the first observation). Robin was a surprise to me though she was always at the teachers elbow and this might have said something more about Robin than the teacher in terms of interest. I believe that the Teacher did consider student needs did express a sense of humor about student behaviors and incidents in the class, and did believe in control. It also seems to me

that the teacher may have had deeper feelings about things that were happening in the classroom than appeared on the surface.

~~Areas~~ that would be interesting to compare between teacher 01 and 02 would be
expression of professional role and personal role
projections of expectations of students (and student self concept)
organization and task definition
time usage
clarity
accepted behaviors of students

I feel that this teacher saw herself as in control of the material and the class but that she projected personal expectations onto the students (some of whom were able to meet them) and saw the classroom as an extention of her professional self. This self may have been more organizational that expressed through content.

(this description is intended to compliment the interview categories/information as listed in the teacher notebook)

CLINICAL DESCRIPTION T 02 Appendix B
Ethnographer 03

T 02's classroom was a corner room in a complex of four rooms devoted to the second grade. She had the most awkward size room. the room being more the shape of a triangle than anything close to a square. As the student load in the room was around 22 student, the room was used to capacity. The teacher continually expressed frustration with the shape of the room and her inablility to find an order to the room that allowed her and the students freedom of movement or easy organization. She changed the structure of the room at least 3 times after Christmas, trying the traditional rows of desks facing front, desks grouped in twos, and tables created by putting 6 or 8 desks together. This last format was the one that best seemed to suit her needs. Organization of the classroom was important to organization of the class as this was a weak point to the teacher. I felt her attempts to re-organize the classroom indicative of individual attempts to reorder the pattern of activities.

The blackboard was on the hypotenus of the triangle room, with coat racks on one of the other sides, and buliten boards on another. The room always had a calander board indicating things like birthdays and important events. The walls were also decorated with signs of the most recent holidays--Christmas, etc. and art work of the children in the home room. Later in th observation the Teacher began to use large paper pads or large posters with assignments written on them so that the students would have easy reminders of what they were to do. These alsc were posted on the wall or leaning against a wall on a table. The teacher said that she decided to use the posters/pads so that she would not have to waste time writing assignments on the board. While she probably was influenced in this idea by T 01, who had a room next to her, these did not represent individualized contracts but assignment geared to whole reading groups. The room also had a reading table to one side, and bookcases with Basel readers, spelling books, and extra reading. There were sinks and cupboards on the sides of the blackboard. At the later part of the year, the Teacher's desk faced the side of the class with the desks forming long tables perpendicular to the blackboard. There were tow entrances to the classroom, one on either side of the blackboard wall.

The tone of the class was almost always noisy. I seldom recorded a noise level below 3 and then only when the class was actively writing something. The teacher dealt with the students primarily on a one to one basis, which tended to allow the other students to do what they wanted while she was dealing with one student. The teacher seemed honestly interested in the students and treated them as people more than as 'inferiors'. In other words, it is possible there was some question for her as to what her teacher role consisted of in relation to the students. I hope to get back to this point. The teacher was consistent in the tone of voice used with the students, which was generally pleasnat if a bit pleading on occasion. She often elaborated her comments with personal anecdotes and allowed the students to do the same. If anything this contributed to the lack of time to cover necessary subject ground. The Teacher did seem concerned for students who were having problems and gave them much leaway.

There were two reading groups in the reading class--the R2D2's (Dragons) and the Sandpeople (Longhorns). R2D2's were the lower of the two, but both were second grade level. There seemed to be a predominance of boys in the

class, though this could be an impression furthered by the fact that the boys in the class were especially disruptive. The teacher, however does not mark a lot of them as disruptive in her profile, so that causes me to think that one of us (she or I) has a different idea about disruptiveness. Generally, they appeared to make consistent attempts to distract class activities, attempts which were usually successful, and which the T often didn't even seem to notice, or would blame herself for as not having adquately prepared. The R2D2 group in particular has only 3 girls to 7 boys and was the group that presented particular problems to the Teacher, not only because they were the lower group (though some of them were good readers) but also because they had particular problem children in the group. Notably Greg (who I didn't see as as bad as some others, though the teacher did), Jodie (who didn't seem to have much of a social awareness but was very interested in getting attention, and manipulated, and was manipulated by the teacher via this point. Jodie was very strange, hard to keep on task, and almost determined to distract you from the questions during the student interviews. But he does have a sense of humor, and is intelligent), also Mark (a follower more than anything, but would follow the troublemakers who in this class could be any number of people), Justin (probably the most compulsive worker, likes to learn, but falling under the influence of the 'crowd'), Chris and David (they may look sweet..and the T says that they are, but they are as involved in carrying on as much as anybody else, especially Chris). The teacher has further problems with this group because many of them are in title I and she has to wait for them to come back to class before she can work with the group which often means that they don't get enough time.

The Sandpeople group is easier to work with, they don't resist the Teacher as much . At the beginning of the observations Arthur was a bit of a problem but one that acted alone so that the teacher could use group pressure, or pointing out Arthur's behavior as an example to the rest to keep hime from interfering as much as the group antics of the R2D2 group do to that group. The Teacher reported that she and Arthur's parents and Jennine Brown used some kind of behavior mod program on him which appeared to work and he no longer proved a disruption, if anything changed to a good example. In one of the November observation there is (I think) a good description of some of Arthur's behaviors and T's response. Yolanda and Shelly are ideal students in this group. I feel that Shelly see herself as the Teacher-student in relation to the rest of the class and will assume the teacher's role if the teacher should be missing from the class. In one observation the T asked Shelly to move to her chair (above the others on the floor) and read the directions to the group while she went to do something ( ). Shelley automatically SEE VTR 1/26 all but took on the teacher's personal manerisms, and got some ridicule from the other students about it. This did not appear to bother Shelley. Later in the year comment by students about the fact that the teacher called on Shelley to do everything that requires personal responsibility (i.e. taking things to the office, passing out papers) increased such that this bias on behalf of the teacher was overly evident, yet the teacher herself did not seem too aware of it, and commented that Shelley's good behavior had decreased though I could see no evidence of change. Shelley was a good student. Perhaps a fall from favor.
the only other major problem in this group was Craig who tended to drift off and this concerned the teacher. She later attempted to resolve this problem by working with him more individually and making sure that he got the directions straight in the first place.

The teacher, herself, was a medium size, persentable woman of about early thirtish, recently divorced with a couple of children. She had worked previously as a receptionist in Doctors office, and had taught some a long time ago. She was very accepting of the observations, though she said that they made her nervous. When nervous she would fill the air with reasons why things had happened (was here late because of parents night, I don't like the teacher's manual, I should have thought that out better, this is my first year teaching). If anything, she took too much responsibility for things that went wrong and was consantly appologizing for them. Given this I admire her for her courage. Her class was consistantly caotic (chaotic?) Once she had gotten used to the presence of the ethnographers she would often explain things to us out of the side of her mouth, make faces, ask us what our opinions were about things, in general consider us allies rather than threats to her. Her manner was a bit nervous and fluttery but very human. She acted like a normal person rather than a 'teacher' or authority figure. While this was i n many ways refreshing, it was was also a problem for her in that she presented herself as someone who did not know what she was doing to us and to the kids, though they, like us, responded to her as an individual. She used the same tone of voice with everyone, student and adult, and seldom raised her voice. In fact, you might call that a distinguishing characteristic. She was generally cheerful, though occasionally looked over-tired.

Activities during reading period were organized so that the teacher would have time with both reading groups, usually taking time to answer questions of individuals or talk to students between taking groups and then work with whole class at the end (either spelling or with workbooks). At the beginning of the observation period she did some reading aloud but not much. She said that she felt that students read better and enjoyed it more when they read silently. Most of the later half of the school year was spent on phonics, spelling, word skills, etc. rather than reading per se. I fact I seldom saw them read even at their desks after Feb/March. Near the end of the year much more time seemed to be taken up with spelling. It was my impression that this classroom had a particular problem with use of time and organization of activities. The narratives indicate that a great deal of time was lost in transitions from one activity to another, mostly due to lack of teacher clarity or authority in enforcing student response to new task. The teacher would tend to let the students get themselves ready which given this class took a long time. Or she would go down the list checking with each student individually to see if they were ready. I think the ideal here was to give example to the others to be ready but it didn't work that way. Between reading groups, students would come and distract her with related and unrelated questions (which she would listen too) and the same whenever a workbook or spelling assignment/test was given. The pencil sharpener probably has to be changed one a month for all the activity it sees in these transitions. (see narrative , game set up before spelling test; or narrative , pre spelling test). The students often give the impression of <u>coordinating</u> activity to distract from any real work. While this seems pretty far out of line, and is probably not conscious, they do seem to be on the same wave length about how to provide a distraction (see Justin and Marc, narrative).

As many of the descriptive elements of the class are listed in the teacher notebook/interview categories, from here on I will try to address specific areas relevant to this teacher and her interactions with students:

T 02

areas of interest:

CONTROL OF CLASS. Basically the teacher had a hard time controling the class. If there was any significant factor influencing her ability to convey the information necessarry to cover a second grade reading program, this was it. Part of the problem was due to a difficult combination of student personalities. But part of it was the way she herself approached discipline and control. Many times Ouita and I (and others reading narratives) were amazed that she didn't due some of what might be the simplest things to maintain attention and teacher control. Any distraction proved to be a distraction for the whole class and left her with the task of regaining momentum and attention. This is especially evident in the videotapes. The teacher herself was easily distracted, and may have subconsciously not wanted to pursue the lesson, or at least not have been very committed to teaching it, as she herself would often contribute to the distraction by dwelling on it. (see videotape 1/26. 3/2). Another problem with control appeared to be organization. The teacher viewed organization as the key to control and continuously changed the room around, tried varying the lesson plans, or the style of presentation, or her own approach to the information. She feared student boredom (or her own?) and saw that as one reason that students lost attention. In T interview 5/22 she expresses a fear that she might be gearing the lessons too low. While I feel that she did begin to resolve this problem near the end of the observations, she never spent enough time developing any one solution to see if it worked consistently. In this she was much like her students who seemed to prefer activity however distracting to concentrated effort. And like them again, she was confused about what to do to resolve what she recognized as some problem. (see rationalizations in T notebook). While she expresses a desire to be firmer with students from the beginning, she also wanted to learn how to do this in a more positive vein (positive reinforcement). As she wished students to like her (5/22) this would be consistent. She does not view herself or present herself as an authority figure.

Approaches to controling the class were primarily one to one. The T would single out the student and comment on his/her behavior for good or bad, or take them aside and deal with them, or ignore them and complain generally about how their behavior was upseting her. Relevant categories to this approach would be:

PERSONALIZING: Teacher would personalize information, making it relevant to herself or to a student. This has an advantage of making the student self concsious and posibly altering his/her behavior. It is also a guilt inducing technique. When someone misbehaves she personalizes their effect on the class, or on her. Examples of things given in spelling tests, etc. are based on her or the students personal experiences. I might characterize the relationship between teacher and student as a peer-personal one rather than a teacher-student one. Consistent with this she wishes to develop more individualized independent contract-style of working for next year. (see daily routine in T notebook)

TEACHER RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENT: the most salient point here is I think the teachers application of a mother-mode to her teacher role. ("I'm kinda like my mother. I look like my mother in these videotapes"). While this may be a bit psycholanlytic her concern for students, and her one to one style of interaction was more like that of a mother's compassion and tolerance than like a teacher. With some of the behavior problems in the class (Jody) this worked well. With others (Bobbie, Greg) it didn't. But it did appear to increase their trust of her. They were not threatened by

her. and on a one to one level interacted with her well. It is in the group that problems arise. She seems especially fond of boys (I wonder if her own children are boys) though girls would flock around her desk at the end of the class. I thought at one point that she was a marked contrast to T 01 in that she was motherly-feminine to boys, while T 01 was firm-authoritarian favoring girls.

STUDENT PROBLEMS Many of the class did have emotional or learning disabilities. see student comments. I feel that a great deal of consistant discipline would have been necessary for any teacher with this class. T 02's inexperience was no help here, and she didn't get enough support from administration. I t is possible that what the administration wanted out of this class was a kind of maintainance program.

SELF CONCEPT (TEACHER)
Well, this may be touchy. T 02's class is problematic for a number of reasons. First of all the T's own home life (i.e. recent divorce and new job) may have contributed to a high degree of insecurity, self consciousness, and scattered energy. It is undeniably difficult for a first year teacher. She is not familiar with, or is only becoming familiar with, the subject areas and the tried and true teacher handlings of students such as the old rule of being especially firm at the onset. It ould appear she is applying discipline according to what she des know--motherhood, and her ideals of what a PERSON should be or do. Her interactions with students are personal, one to one, guilt manipulative, and often self conscious. She has expressed that she wants students to LIKE HER as well as to regard her as a teacher (5/22) Her rationalizations for student behaviors are equally individualistic and personal i.e. they have a bad home, emotional problems, handicaps, are immature, etc (or stubbron). She (amazingly) does not seem to be aware of group dynamics or affiliations. She singles out individuals as a means to gaind class or group attention which either has little effect (Jodie I can hear your voice talking, to a group that includes Jodie) or wastes time (Arthur has his paper ready, Shelley has her, down the line). She seem s especially concerned with boys (what relation to husband or children) using feminine, motherly, ploys to control their behavior (the boys are the problem). I have seen her embrace or cuddle boys (Marc in) but not girls, though this may be an accident of observation. She has gotton fairly positive response from some with this (mentioned earlier). In general, however, such an individual personal focus leaves T at the mercy of the larger group. T approach to discipline usually serves only to provide more distraction. Most of the Teacher's energies are taken up by organizing or settling people down rather than presenting material.

I view the Teacher as insecure and self conscious, but she tries.

TEACHER METHODS OF ATTENTION GETTING
directing comments to specific students
gimmicks
touching students to get their attention
calling on student who do not have their hands up (often ignoring stu-ents who do) problem boys get consistently called on
sitting silent
calls by last name "Mr. Hurd"
lecturing on IMPORTANCE of lesson, doing work (no change in voice tone)
providing a moral lesson (people who want to be heard raise their hands)
acts out (zips up mouth)
(see narrative/elaboration 12/12 in T notebook)

T 02

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS: T doesn't pressure stu-ents, and I think they think that for the most part that they can do what they want. She lets them set their own limits which doesn't work well with the class as a whole but has some advantages for individuals. Students tend to gang up on her, which often she doesn't seem to see. At times it appears very deliberate. With Bobbie, Arthur, Justin, Jodie, or Greg as leaders.

TEACHER QUESTIONING: Teacher theoretically has students raise their hands but often calls on students at random. Or calls on students who may give her trouble, or loose attention, like Arthur or Jodie. She will usually give a student time to answer before calling on another, and then will go back to the first and humorously explain what might have been the problem for them or give them another chance. This is where personalizing provides a very non threatening context for students to explore information in. Students often shout out answers in a group. Or shout out questions to Teacher, which she will respond with how they SHOULD act i.e. raise their hands. But they consistently shout out answers. She doesn't back it up.

STUDENT GROUP AFFILIATIONS
there seemed to be some clustering of individuals with Delane, John, and sometimes Bobbie around Arthur and David, Marc, Chris, around Greg and Jodie, with some slight sntagonism between Arthur and Jodie. That would make sense as before Jodie arrived on the scene Arthur was the prime attention getter in behavior problems, and now Jodie is. That may be one reason that Arthur's behavior mod is slipping (see Teacher Interview 5/22).

TEACHER REMARKS ABOUT STUDENTS
some surprises here (for me). T said that she like Chris C, David P, and Carrissa best, and saw them all a low disrupters. I wouldn't say that, nor do I understand her liking of those particular boys. She likes Katherine Hill and Arthur least. Arthur was a surprise. dispite all the attention she gives to Shelley, T rated her average on everything, and rather Karen abouve average. I would have thought Karen below average.

TASK STRUCTURES; As I understand it, T presents information in accords with how well she understands it and has prepared it. I think you could play with this in terms of this teacher and Doyle (Task Structures and Student Roles in Classrooms) especially as clarity is a bit of a problem andgenerally risk is minimal. In fact, this may be an example of a case where the risk is too minimal to be interesting. Activities may appear meaningless to students encouraging rebellion against the structure of the lesson. (Rebellion does not occur as much to the teacher as an individual). The teacher herself, does not seem as convinced as to the relevance of the lesson as to the importance of the behavior/emotional security of the student. In other words she places personal issues first, academic issues somewhere else. (Craig Hurd may be one major exception, but that may be due to her confusion about him as a person).

The T is very self orientated. As evidence for this I would point to her use of personal information in elaborating examples for students, personal repremands to herself for not having done a good job with something, lack of awareness of other things operating in the classroom as a whole, comments to videotapes all concerned her performance (usually as not pleased with looks or performance). All roads lead to Rome.

Appendix C

TEACHER 03

A "Typical" Morning with Teacher 03 (8:30 to 10:30 a.m.)

The 23 students in teacher 03's homeroom sit quietly as the teacher walks among them, passing out dittoed papers. There are two Mexican Americans; the others are Anglos. Their desks are grouped together so that students sit on opposite sides of rectangular or square tables, facing each other. There are two squares, seating four students; and two rectangles, seating five or six. Two students, Stephen and Mark, sit at isolated desk units on either side of the room. There is a chalkboard at the front, to the left of the teacher's desk; and at the rear, to the left of a small table. A semicircle of small chairs faces the back ~~of the~~ blackboard.

As the teacher finishes passing out papers, she notices Alex's, and asks, "Is your name on your paper?" Her expression is solemn; her tone flat and expressionless. She raises her voice slightly and addresses the class, reminding all of them to put their names on their papers. She waits a minute, then walks toward the front of the room. On the way, she says, "I see some papers without names." Then, with a little more emphasis, "Stephen, put your name on it."

From the front, the teacher points out the subject of the worksheet -- suffixes. She has Ronnie read the instructions, then asks, "what's a suffix?" Bobby answers, and the teacher reinforces the correctness of his response by repeating it to the class. "What are some suffixes?" Many students raise their hands, and Jennifer, Julianne, Mark, Mason, Shawn, and Bobby are called on. They all give good examples, which the teacher accepts with a nod. She does not praise. It is as though correct responses are only to be expected.

She does receive an incorrect, or incomplete, response, when she goes on to ask "what is a prefix?" Cindy answers, "a beginning." The teacher prompts, "what else?" She waits a second before calling on Kim with the words, "can you help?" Kim says, "It comes before the root word." The teacher nods and repeats Kim's answer.

On the next section of the worksheet, the teacher calls on Paul to read the directions, which concern the root word "long." The teacher asks, "Arthur, do you see a word that has 'long' in it, but now its a new word?" Arthur hesitates. Many hands go up, but the teacher waits for him. When he finally

answers, he is right. She pursues the instructions further, asking, "so what part do you underline?"

The teacher goes over all the different tasks on the worksheet in the same way, having students read the instructions, clarify them, and do examples, bit by bit. Then she hands out another sheet, on math, and another, for fun, and repeats the same procedure for each. After she finishes explaining them, she tells the students how to order them, which to do first. They arrange their papers, and hold the set of worksheets above their heads. The teacher proceeds from student to student, stapling their papers together.

They begin working quietly. The teacher walks to the back of the room, and sits at the table. She spends a few minutes looking over the teacher's manual and writing words on the board. At 8:40, she moves to the chair closest to the blackboard in the reading semicircle, and calls out, "I want my Star Wars with workbooks only." Teacher 03's Star Wars group is the second-lowest in the second grade. They are reading on the first grade level, in the Harcourt Brace series used in this school for "off-level" students.

Stuart, Arthur, John, and Wendy come promptly to the back, but Mason dawdles. While they're on their way, Kim comes to the reading area to ask a question about her "morning work." The teacher answers her briefly, then goes ahead and ~~beings~~ begins as Mason drags up to take his place. She announces that she is going to grade page 25. She goes down the row of students, taking and grading each workbook in turn. The Star Wars squirm, yawn, and look around disinterestedly as she marks their errors and returns each book with a low-key remark like "good," or "you need to correct this." When she gets to Wendy's book, the teacher says, "Wendy, know what I saw you doing yesterday? Before you even read it, you were numbering. I told you you had to read it first." Wendy answers in a small voice, "I read it." The teacher hands her book back, saying, "Well, your numbers were all wrong. You're a smart girl and you can read. You need to be more careful." Wendy averts her eyes from the teacher's gaze.

The teacher begins a phonics lesson on the "s" or "z" sound that "s" makes at the end of a word. She calls on each student in turn to answer with regard to a word on the board, "what does 's' say in _____?" They all answer correctly except Wendy. The teacher cues her by saying, "listen again," but it is clear that she's only guessing. For the second part of the lesson, the teacher says two words aloud, and asks students to indicate whether the ending sound is the same or not. Again Wendy answers incorrectly.

The rest of the class is quiet, except for Jennifer, Cathy, and Heidi, who have finished their worksheets already and are playing a game on the floor. The teacher pauses from the Star Wars lesson to say, simply, "people on the floor." They get a little quieter, but as they continue to play, they become increasingly animated. In a minute, the teacher pauses to announce dispassionately, "Girls, you may get a book to read, but you can't play games. You're too noisy."

She returns her attention to the group and proceeds to assign workbook pages. When she calls on Wendy to do an example, she again fails to distinguish the "s" and "z" sound. The teacher looks at Arturk, who is next in line: "Do you agree?" He chooses the other alternative. The teacher looks back at Wendy and asks with mild concern, "Can't you hear that?" Wendy nods and looks vacant as she fiddles with her workbook. The teacher seems dubious. At 8:50, she dismisses the others, but tells Wendy to stay in the reading area, "so I can help you with this some more."

The teacher gets up to deal briefly with the rest of the class. She passes out and explains extra worksheets for those who have already finished everything else. Then she dismisses her homeroom students who go to other teachers for reading and receives the entering students. Her reading class is composed of students who come from other homerooms as well as some who remain from her morning class. In addition to the Star Wars, the teacher has 16 students, all of whom are on the same level: "high average." They are "on-level" (reading in second grade texts in the Economy series), and are a little ahead of the "low average" on-level students in teacher 05's reading class. They are the second-highest reading students in the second grade: bright, articulate, motivated, quick. The group is homogeneous, but unmanageably large for certain kinds of activities, so the teacher has split them into "Vikings" and "Dolphins." She deals with them together when they are working at their seats, but she only has room to call one group at a time to the semicircular reading area at the back. In either case, together or apart, they do the same work.

The teacher announces the Vikings and Dolphins reading assignment and return to Wendy. Now she switches tactics: "We're going to work with beginning sounds instead of ending sounds." She says some examples, and Wendy identifies all of the beginning sounds correctly. The teacher

explains the difference in the "s" and "z" sounds and tells her that the spelling doesn't matter: "Just because it's spelled with 's' doesn't mean it says 's.'" She return to the original task, and Wendy is able to identify every ending sound. The teacher says "good" after each, and praises her more when she finishes. "You're listening more carefully now, aren't you? Do you think you can do your workbook pages now?" Wendy seems hesitant, but the teacher encourages and reassures her, promising help if she has trouble. She sends her back to her seat.

At 9:00, the teacher gives additional worksheets to students from the other homerooms. Then she calls for the Vikings' and Dolphins' attention: "I want everybody's eyes on the board." Using the back blackboard, she conducts a review phonics lesson. She holds up printed flash cards illustrating a sound or a rule. She questions students on each, and then has them apply the general case to specific examples on the board. Though she does not always call on someone whose hand is raised, she likes to see their hands in the air. If only a few are raised, she waits until more go up before calling on anyone, or she goads them with something like, "Only five people know?" If she calls on someone who is slow to respond, others raise their hands immediately. Generally, the teacher gives the slow student clues instead of calling on someone else. Her phonetic hints are invariably applied successfully.

The teacher intersperses the lesson with individuals' names to regain wandering attention: "So we have two sounds for 'g' followed by a 'u,' don't we Jeremy, depending on whether the next letter is a consonant or a vowel." Occasionally, she will say directly, "Amy, be quiet," or "Ginger, attention"; or she will call on an apparently inattentive student, perhaps Kim, to answer a question.

The phonics review lasts five or ten minutes, during which Wendy comes up and stands near the teacher. She wants help with her workbook. The teacher says quietly, "Sit down. I'm doing a lesson. I'll help you in a little bit." The teacher tells the Vikings and Dolphins to turn to page 80 in their workbooks for a spelling test. While they get ready, she says sternly to Mason (a Star Wars member), "Sit down and get busy." She briefly answers Wendy's question, then begins the test. She has already read two words when she notices that Shawn hasn't yet found page 80. She waits a minute, then repeats the first two words and continues. The students work quickly. There are only a few seconds between words, and the test is over in minutes.

The teacher has the Vikings and Dolphins exchange paper for grading. She cautions them, "If you mark something wrong and it's not, it's going to come off your grade." She begins reading the correct answers, monitoring them closely for deviations from the quiet, efficient model she prefers. Jeremy is jiggling up and down in his seat in an excess of boyish energy. "Do you know where we are?" the teacher asks. He does, but she says "pay attention" as if he hadn't. When she finishes reading the answers, she tells them how to grade: "If they missed zero, E happy face; one, E; two, E minus . . ." and so on. "E" is excellent, "S" satisfactory, "N" needs work. No one misses more than six (N).

She announces the next assignment even as the students return the graded books to their owners. This bit of business involves some bustling about, and the teacher is slightly impatient to get it over with. She says in a tone of mild reproach, "O.k., we're waiting . . . ." In a mipute, all are settled, and she explains the new workbook page, following her usual routine. She calls on students to read the instructions, answer clarifying questions, and do examples. She passes out several worksheets, too, explaining them in the same manner. She concludes, "these are your worksheets that you're supposed to do." All begin working quietly, students on their worksheets, teacher on her lesson preparations at the table at the back of the room. It is about 9:30.

Several students come back to her for help. She talks to each in turn, telling them a word they don't know or clarifying a task. Often she re-directs their attention, asking questions that enable them to resolve their problems for themselves.

In a few minutes, she calls for the Dolphins, "with your reading books." They hasten to the back somewhat noisily, and the teacher "ssssh's" them before beginning a round of questions about the day's story. She goes down the row, asking each a question about plot, characters, content. She tries to reconstruct vague answers into more nearly correct responses, accepting and guiding with phrases like "yes, but . . . ." From time to time, she refers to her manual.

When Mark's turn comes, the teacher asks, "why did Cindy go to City Hall?" He replies with half-hearted flippancy, "Maybe she was on trial." The teacher says nothing for a minute. Her face is blank. When Mark does not correct himself, she says, "Don't you know? Did you read the story?" He nods. "You must not have read it very well because that's the main idea

of the story." Her voice is quiet, expressing patience and disappointment. She dismisses him from the group with instructions to read the story "carefully" and come back to discuss it with the Vikings.

The teacher finishes her appointed questions and begins the oral reading. She has recently become interested in choral reading and is introducing it to her classes. She feels it keeps them from getting as bored as they would listening to others read, and it helps them "build speed." As in so many other areas, she has precise standards about how it should be done. First they count the words on the page. Then the teacher estimates how long the page should take, using a two word per minute rule. She times their reading with a stop watch and declares it "too slow." They try again on the next page, reading in a sing-song and getting out of synchronization with each other as they try to speed up. Their second timing is better, but still too slow. The teacher has them repeat the same page. This time, they stay together, and finish just a little over the prescribed time. The teacher praises them, but admonishes them, too, telling them they need to practice reading faster at home. The group is dismissed, about ten minutes after they came to the reading area. Half are given restroom permission; the others may go when they return.

The teacher stays at the back, responding to the questions of a few more students who pop up as soon as the Dolphins return to their seats. More than one student has asked about the same thing, and the teacher stands to clarify it for the whole class. Then she puts another worksheet on the "extra work table" and calls their attention to a design game they may play when everything else is finished. She returns to the back and calls for the Vikings. Mark comes too, and performs satisfactorily this time as the teacher repeats the same procedure almost verbatim that she had used with the Dolphins. The Vikings, too, spend about ten minutes in the reading area -- perhaps a little longer, since they are interrupted slightly more often than the Dolphins were. It is later in the period and students are finishing up, becoming involved in noisier activities, and generally becoming somewhat restless and talkative. A little before 10:00, the Vikings are dismissed, again with split restroom privileges.

The teacher calls the Star Wars group. They are slow to come, and she repeats, "I want my Star Wars with your workbooks." When they are settled in the reading area, she reminds them of the subject of the workbook pages and begins grading. She hands some back without comment, praises Wendy and

Arthur briefly, tells Mason to "correct that." The teacher passes out a worksheet and begins explaining in her usual fashion. The group is interrupted when Cindy comes back to ask a question. When she pauses, the teacher takes the opportunity to send Jeremy to his seat for being too noisy at a center. Mark, too, is being unacceptably noisy, so much so that the teacher calls him over to her. He stands with his hands in his pockets while she lectures him: "Is that helping you? Is it helping this group? What are we supposed to do when we finish?" He mutters, "book." The teacher continues, "Yes. What are you going to do?" He repeats, "book." She concludes, "you know right from wrong and you need to do what is right, don't you? I don't want to talk to you about it again." The rest of the Star Wars lesson takes a few more minutes, and they are sent to their seats to work.

The teacher walks around the room, commenting on students' activities and work. To Mason, she says, "that handwriting should be done already." To Amy, "you don't need to talk." She notices Jeremy's work and says in disapproving surprise, "You hadn't finished that and you were at that center? No more of that center all week." She continues patrolling. "Mason, get busy." "Shawn, you need to color this, too." Several students speak out to ask questions when she is near their desks.

Toward the end of the period, she goes to the back and sits again, answering questions for those who line up for help. At 10:29, she tells the class to get ready to go. They begin getting their materials together, leave the centers, put away games they had been playing, return library books to the shelf, and settle in their seats.

Comments

As the preceding narrative suggests, teacher 03's classroom exemplifies the old-fashioned business virtues of efficiency, careful methodical work, conformity, quiet, lack of spontaneity, and product orientation. The plan of the reading period was almost always a variation on the routine described above. The teacher took the Star Wars group first, either during the latter part of homeroom or the first part of reading. She kept them for 10 or 15 minutes, doing workbook or worksheet activities involving word recognition and some phonics. Sometimes they read the story silently and answered comprehension questions. I never saw them read aloud.

When reading period began and her class was assembled, the teacher generally addressed her other groups together. She spend about 15 minutes with them going over phonics or language lessons, explaining assignments, or occasionally giving them a test. When they had enough work to keep them busy a while, the teacher took each group -- Dolphins first, then Vikings -- at the reading area. There they might answer questions about the story; go over vocabulary words; have additional lessons in phonics, word meanings or sentence structure; read aloud; and get further assignments. The teacher seemed always to follow her manual closely. Her questions about the story were often identical with both groups, and seemed to come right out of the book, as did her few nontraditional reading activities (e.g., acting out an animal or drawing a picture of something from the story).

The teacher explained her approach with the Vikings and the Dolphins this way:

> The way I teach this book is that there is one plan for each story, like the first story is plan one. So the first day I present the phonics lesson of the story and first plan the vowels and . . . sounds. O.k., and then I present the words that are reinforced through the phonics. Then they read the story and their words silently at their desks and then they come up and read the words to me that day aloud. And that day they do the workbook pages that go with them and it usually goes rights along with the phonics book. . . . . O.k., then the next day we read the same story, the same words, but we don't have a phonics lesson unless there are activity sheets that go with this that are similar to the workbook pages and if there is something new in that. Which there usually isn't. It's usually the same phonics skill that has been presented the day before so then that day we work on comprehension, what they larned about the story, the main idea, the characters, setting, things like that, and then we read the story aloud. (Interview, 11-9-78)

The Vikings and Dolphins did some silent reading in the group. More often, they read aloud, usually quickly and smoothly, in phrases rather than one word at a time. The teacher stressed expression and attention to punctuation when individuals read orally. She was minimally responsive with either praise or criticism. It took an outstanding performance to rate more than "o.k." After she became interested in choral reading in the spring, she used it more than individual oral reading. With it, she emphasized "keeping together" and pacing.

The teacher always saw the Star Wars group a second time, after the other groups. Often, she would grade their workbooks or worksheets and give them a new assignment. This took ten minutes or so. Sometimes she would follow-up with them again, with a quick two to five minute lesson or grading

session late in the period. On the average, she might have to interrupt her work with the Star Wars group a couple of times to reprimand or answer a questions for a Viking or Dolphin. Her directives to the Star Wars were more often to "pay attention" than to "be quiet." She seldom had to interrupt the other groups at all; and when she did, she generally saw to it that the interruptions were brief and produced the desired effect.

When she was not with a group, the teacher devoted her time to management activities, lesson preparation, and response to student questions. She used the same technique in dealing with individuals that she used with the groups: She would have the student read the instructions, ask him or her a few general questions, and then ask for the specific application that had prompted the student's question. This method was very effective for getting students to handle their own problems, to find the answer without being told straight out.

The teacher expressed two main strategies for handling student differences: grouping; and (for differences within groups too small to warrant a change in placement), extra work or extra attention. She seemed very conscientious about the composition of her groups. Hers were the most homogeneous, and she was the only teacher I observed to initiate changes in placement during the course of the year. She had three students move up a level.

The "extra work" strategy was devised to keep students busy and not too bored. It seemed primarily to serve the teacher's needs rather than the students. It was supposed to reinforce their skills, but it was necessarily the quicker, and usually better, students who got the extra work.

In addition to the extra work, there were "center" activities to "reward" students who finished early. The centers had five themes -- one for each day of the week: Your World, Create, Listening, Math and Language. The projects were changed weekly. The students would consult the "center wheel" to see which they were to go to on a given day. The teacher believed that centers provided variety, a chance to move around, and independence training. Again, these were not available to students who probably needed them most, since the "lower" students seldom finished their regular work in time to go to a center.

There was a heavy emphasis on written work in the classroom. As noted above, the students were inundated with "extra work" and "fun sheets." Even in reading period, these were supposed to take priority over the individualized, non-productive and unmonitorable activity of reading for

pleasure. When the teacher tried to encourage extra reading late in the year, she tied it to written products (book report forms that had to be filled out in complete sentences).

The teacher's control of the class was uncanny. Its activities were tightly organized and smooth running. The teacher's authority was established so well that she seldom seemed to exercise it visibly. Her directives were couched in terms of "what you need to do" or "what you should do." Sometimes this was even expressed in the passive voice, as in "that work needs to be done" or "that should already be done." The teacher invoked a real or pretended consensus about norms whenever there were deviations from her standards. Her reprimands were moralistic: Not the force of her personality or authority, but rather appeals to right and wrong, were brought to bear on deviants. Rather than saying "go and do X," she would ask "what should you be doing?"

This is not to say that she did not issue commands. She did; typically, "get busy," "attention," "quiet." But as I noted above, she used questions and declaratives as often as imperatives to make her wishes known. All had the effect of commands -- striking examples of the sociolinguistic principle that the meaning of a sentence is not entirely in its form, but also in the relationship between speaker and hearer.

TEACHER 04

A "Typical" Morning with Teacher 04 (8:30 to 10:30 a.m.)

The 24 students in teacher 04's second grade home room are seated in paired desk modules, lined up in traditional rows and columns. Except for one Mexican American girl, all are Anglos. All are about equally well dressed in T-shirts and pants or shorts. A few of the girls wear dresses.

Around the room are the usual accoutrements of second grade classrooms: a handwriting chart, a clock, colorful posters, examples of student art. There are also hand-lettered charts, made by the teacher, that list phonetic units (digraph, blend, schwa), parts of speech (verb, noun), figures of speech (onomatopoeia) and so on.

At the front of the room, a large blackboard shows assignments for the day, the order of work, vocabulary words and a handwriting exercise entitled "I Like Fall." To the right of the blackboard is the teacher's desk; to the left, a small round table, where the teacher is sitting, talking to two boys. The other students are busy at their desks, copying "I Like Fall" or doing their "morning work" -- dittoed exercises devoted ~~to~~ largely to math. The boys at the table have a different assignment, because they are behind. The teacher is going over it with them. She gives them instructions on their math worksheet, then asks Tim to do the first example. He responds correctly. She asks Tom the same question. He sits silently, his forehead resting on his hand, staring at his paper. The teacher is impatient. "You weren't listening," she says. "Tim just told you the answer." She has Tim do the second example, then turns again to Tom. He cannot find the place. Instead of pointing it out, the teacher repeats her orders over and over: "Read the first example. The first example." When he finds it, she drills him in an annoyed monotone: "Read the first one to me. Read the second one. Read the third one. So what is the answer?" Tom answers softly, "seven?" She responds, "it can't be seven. It can only be one in the example. There are only three numbers in the whole list. What are they? And what," she says loudly, "is the third number?" He answers "nine," then "five." Both are wrong. Finally the teacher points to the page: "What is this number?" Tom says "fourteen." She repeats, "then what is the third number?" He answers "nine."

The teacher is increasingly annoyed. Her manner conveys simultaneous incredulity and resignation. There is an edge in her voice as she responds, "you already said 'nine.'" He says "five." She repeats, "you already said 'five.'" At last Tom, in tears, tries fourteen. The teacher replies, "that is the answer," and proceeds immediately to the next example. It is a problem of the same type, on "number families," and again Tom has trouble. The teacher seems frustrated. She gets up to attend to other matters, saying "we've been doing number families for the last six months. Where have you been? You can't have been paying attention! You're not trying."

Tim and Tom are sent to their seats to finish the worksheets alone. The teacher reminds the rest of the class to get their reading materials ready to go. In a few minutes, thirteen student will leave her room for reading with other teachers. Many of those who remain will change seats for the reading period, which lasts from 8:50 to 10:30. This teacher has a very tight schedule for reading because her students are all "off level"; i.e., they are reading in first-grade basals or primers. Because they are behind, and/or deemed to have "problems," many are enrolled in special programs (Title 1, "resource," speech, and bilingual education) that meet during the reading period. She has one boy who leaves at 9:20, three girls who don't arrive until 9:40, two that leave at 9:40, 11 that leave at 10:00. Her work on reading in the classroom must be planned around their diverse schedules, which dictate the order in which she must take groups: Genies first, then Star Wars, and the bilingual student(s) last. This also affects the placement of students in groups. For example, Panchita and Maria do the same work as the Genies, but have to be treated independently because of time conflicts between the bilingual and other programs; and Becky, one of the Genies, has to work with that group partly because it is the only one available when she is in the room.

Because the teacher takes the Genies first, she gives them their reading assignment during homeroom, at about the same time that she reminds the rest of the class to get ready for reading. During the next ten minutes or so, the Genies are to read their story. The others are supposed to finish their morning work and place it on the teacher's desk.

When the teacher is preoccupied with chores of her own (bureaucratic demands or lesson preparations), students may goof off and get away with it, especially after they finish. Today, however, she walks around the room,

responding to the raised hands of students who need help. As she does, she notices infractions of her rules. Angie and Chris are not working. The teacher tells them to find something to do: "You know I'm not going to have you sit and do nothing. You can always get a book to read." John is not working either, and her response to him is more severe. John is a chronic malingerer, behind in all his work. The teacher warns him: "You need to be working on yesterday's work. You're not going to reading until it's done." He says o.k., but continues to play with his scissors and pencil, handling them in every conceivable way, and looking at them as if they were the most interesting objects on earth.

To other students, the teacher gives help, sometimes solicited and sometimes not, often in a jocular or teasing manner. She jokes with Travis about "carrying" on his addition paper: "Did you eat your Wheaties this morning? It's easy if you only have to carry one. If you have to carry two, it gets heavy. You have to use both hands." She points out an example of poor handwriting on Becky's paper, saying playfully, "I'd mark that wrong because I'm fussy." Becky nods gravely and says, "I know."

At 8:50, the teacher has students who leave line up, except for John, who is still not finished. There is some talking as they wait to be dismissed. The teacher announces, "I'm not going to open the door while you girls are chatting." When they are quiet, she says "alright, you may go." She follows, accompanying them to other rooms. Soon after, her own reading students come in. There is one black girl, Lynn, among them, and a Mexican American boy, Raymundo. The others are Anglos. Their reading assignment is on the board, and they sit and begin working quietly even though the teacher is still out of the room. She returns momentarily. After checking with the Genies to see if they have finished their story, she calls them to the round table.

There are three Genies. They are officially the poorest readers in the second grade (excepting only two or three pupils who are so "low" that they are not doing any reading at all). Although classed together, the Genies show a rather wide range of reading accomplishment. Becky is the least competent. The teacher acknowledges that she is miplaced. But Becky begged to be included in a group, and the Genies were the best available option. The teacher placed her there, and feels she is benefitting from the extra practice. Nathan and Tim get bored when she takes her turn at oral reading, because

her reading is so labored; and Nathan, especially, gets impatient when she is slow to respond to the teacher's questions. The teacher makes no concessions to the boys' boredom. Becky seems to enjoy being a Genie. She is quick to arrive at the table, and seems eager to participate and pleased with her little successes. The teacher is encouraging, solicitous, and at times indulgent, as she is with all the Genies.

The teacher begins this morning by returning phonics worksheets they had done earlier. She points out their errors and makes fun of some of them by mispronouncing words according to their mistakes. "You said tŭlips," she says to one. They look at each others' papers and laugh, comparing their mistakes and the number they missed. The teacher asks if they have questions about what they did and, as there are none, she calls their attention to vocabulary words on a small chalkboard on the wall behind her. Two of the words are "think" and "thank." The teacher talks about the different vowel sounds, and comments that Nathan (who has a heavy Texas accent) says these words alike. This opens up a flood of personal remarks to which the teacher listens, nodding and smiling. They are aware that she is from Massachusetts and speaks differently than they. She often points out regional variations in pronunciation and terminology. Now she is careful to explain, "I'm not trying to change the way you talk. I just want you to know." In a minute, Becky ways, "I live in Massachusetts." The teacher smiles and says "no you don't." They talk a while longer before the teacher brings the subject back to their words. She has them read words, and she questions them about different phonetic features: What is the vowel sound? How many syllables? Where do you divide it? Occasionally, the teacher uses the word in a sentence, or "acts out" the word to illustrate its meaning. She pretends to hit Becky when no one can think of another meaning for "duck" besides "bird." The students talk freely, and the word list stimulates them to the most diverse digressions about places they've been, movies they've seen, what their daddy said, what they had for breakfast. Each time, the teacher nods and accepts the students' talking up to a point, then abruptly shifts back to her lesson plan.

When they finish going over their words, they open <u>Pug</u> and begin reading aloud. The story is very simple; the words short and familiar. Tim and Nathan read competently, if haltingly, but Becky has trouble with every other word. It takes a painfully long time for her to finish a

sentence. Each time she misses a word, the teacher coaches her. She tells her the sound of the letters, refers to a rhyming word Becky already knows, or breaks the word into more manageable parts. She hints, "that's an old word," or "that's a spelling word for this week." Sometimes she questions Becky, "what's that beginning sound? Then how can it be what you said?" Nathan and Tim fidget.

There is a clatter as something hits the floor. The teacher looks up and sees Lynn picking up a small personal object. Annoyed, she says, "put that on my desk. That's the last time I'm going to see or hear that today." While the teacher had been working with the Genies, Travis had been sitting in class, holding his hand up. Now the teacher notices and calls on him. He get permission to go to the restroom.

The teacher returns her attention to the Genies, and they finish reading their story. They talk about it briefly. Then they get reading worksheets, to match words and sounds with pictures. The teacher goes over the directions on each page, and makes sure that they can identify the pictures. She has them do examples and checks to see that they are getting them right. Tim talks aloud as he works: "I might get an E this time. Will you grade it after we finish? It's time to go." The teacher replies, "no, I want you to finish," and continues going through the worksheets until all are explained. Then, about 25 minutes after they came to the reading area, the Genies are dismissed to finish their work at their seats.

The teacher goes to her desk and picks up a stack of workbooks. She beings handing them out to the other students. The rest of her class, with a few exceptions, constitutes the Star Wars "group." Tom is not in Star Wars because he has reading in Title 1 and his mother feels that additional reading in class would be too much for him. Judy, Panchita, and Maria are working at a lower level than the Star Wars. They are bilingual. Panchita and Maria work separately with the teacher in an unnamed group. Judy does not join in because she goes to Title 1 and is out of the room when the teacher works with Panchita and Maria. They do approximately the same work as the Genies, but Panchita does it more quickly than Maria and with less apparent effort.

Star Wars is one of the "higher" group, but it is still the third lowest in the second grade. Whereas the Genies started with a primer, Star Wars began the year in the first grade basal. Like the Genies, the Star Wars encompass a fairly wide range of reading ability, from Christy, who has almost as

much trouble as Becky, to Lynn and Alex, who read fairly smoothly and with "expression." The ones who read well seem to enjoy reading aloud, and sometimes the teacher lets them do fun things with oral reading. Once, when they were reading "The Breman Band," she assigned certain students to "do the onomatopoeia," and every time a reader came to "the rooster said _____," or "the dog said _____," that student would make the appropriate animal sound.

Neither the Genies nor the Star Wars read aloud every day. Today the Star Wars will simply go over graded pages in their workbooks and get a new assignment. The workbooks contain reinforcing work coordinated with the stories and vocabulary in the basals. For the Star Wars, the publisher of both text and workbook is Harcourt Brace. The Harcourt Brace series was "recommended" by the administration for off-level students, and the teacher thinks it works well for them because it is more repetitious and has an easier vocabulary than the alternative series published by Economy.

After the teacher hands out the last workbook, Raymundo, who still has not gotten his back, asks, "did you check mine?" The teacher snaps back, "did you bring it to me like I told you? How can I grade it if I don't have it?" To the rest of the class, she says, "Everybody turn to page 106, except Raymundo, whose book hasn't been checked." The teacher asks if anyone has a question, and a few students ask about their mistakes. The teacher responds from the front of the class, explaining why their answers were wrong. When there are no more questions, she turns to the board to introduce their new assignment. Before beginning, she pauses briefly to tell Raymundo when she'll check his workbook. While she does, someone nearby speaks out proudly: "That's my third seal!" (Colorful seals are pasted on excellent work.) The teacher replies cheerfully, in a congratulatory tone, "Oh, breaking all kinds of records." She then proceeds to go over the words on the board.

The Star Wars group always work from their seats. The round table is too small to accommodate them, and there is no other reading area in the room. The teacher asks questions about the words on the board. Sometimes she calls on students who raise their hands, and sometimes on someone who seems inattentive or whom she suspects may not understand. She asks many of the same kinds of questions she asked the Genies, though she may be more explicit in emphasizing the "rules for reading." The words are

somewhat more difficult, and the teacher also asks more difficult questions. For instance, after Travis reads "can't," she asks him about the apostrophe. The teacher then wants to know, "So what kind of word is it? It's one of the words up there" (indicating the wall chart). Many students look at the chart and answer, but their responses show little understanding: "Verb?" "Past tense?" Finally Rachelle says hesitantly, "Constraction?" (s.c.) The teacher says "good" enthusiastically and gives a short lesson on contractions, drawing a tiny boot where the apostrophe goes to show that "we booted out a few letters."

After they have read and talked about each word, the teacher asks questions about the story they read silently while she worked with the Genies. It was supposed to have been humorous, and the students laugh dutifully each time the teacher asks, "Did you think it was funny when . . . ?" The more gregarious ones (often the ones nearer the front of the room or the teacher's desk) speak out and relate personal experiences that the story reminds them of. The teacher encourages this, and joins in by talking about her own personal experiences. Nathan seems to have little to do and listens with great interest to all of this. John, who has still not finished and left for his own reading class, is also interested. He tries to join in. When the teacher sees his raised hand, she says sternly, "I have nothing to say to you until you've finished your work." She cuts off the Star Wars reading discussion by announcing that they'll read the story aloud tomorrow.

She passes out worksheets. When she gives Jason his, he comments in a mock-"teach-y" tone, "first thing you do is put your name on them." The teacher assents, saying, "I shouldn't even have to say that any more." When everyone has a worksheet, the teacher tells them to be quiet and begins giving them instructions and having students do examples, just as she did with the Genies. When she has gone over each page, the teacher says, "I want all of you working by yourselves."

Her formal instructions to the group as a whole are over. She walks from student to student, responding to raised hands and checking on those whom she expects to have trouble. In dealing with students' questions, the teacher tries to give them clues that will enable them to figure the answers out for themselves. Sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't. Christy asks her two words that she doesn't recognize. The teacher flatly refuses

to help her with the first: "This one you're supposed to know. It was a spelling word." On the second, she gives her numerous phonetic hints that Christy repeatedly misconstrues. After a long period of prompting that seems somewhat frustrating for them both, Christie reads the word correctly. The teacher leaves her desk saying "you need to work harder at saying those sounds."

The teacher continues helping students until 10:00. Then she reminds Title 1 and speech students that it is time to leave, and that they can finish later if they haven't already. After 10:00, only a few students remain in the room: Alex, Shane, Nathan, Panchita, Maria, Travis, Tim, and Timmy. They constitute a sort of informal extra "group" in the class, although there is no rationale for their being grouped together. They are there only by default. Part of the remainder of reading period is officially and exclusively for Panchita and Maria, but during the rest of the time, the unofficial group often enjoys extra attention from the teacher. They may work on assignments, color, play games, listen to recorded stories, or perhaps do an extra project the teacher introduces. Once when they had read a story on art "rubbings," she showed them how they were done and provided materials for them to do rubbings toward the end of the period. The atmosphere is relaxed, intimate. They have greater latitude in activities and speech, talk more to each other, and to the teacher if she isn't preoccupied with something else. Sometimes this informality gets out of hand, and interferes with the teacher's work with Panchita and Maria. Of all this teacher's reading groups, they are most frequently interrupted by outside distractions.

The teacher usually works with Panchita and Maria for about 15 minutes. Today, they being by playing a game. The teacher has assembled a collection of tiny objects from which Panchita and Maria take turns choosing pairs that rhyme. Panchita seems absorbed. She leans forward, knitting her brows slightly and tapping her foot as she makes her choices. She knows when she has found a rhyming pair, and picks them up quickly with a smile of recognition. Maria seems reluctant, her choices arbitrary. The teacher tries to provide a helpful strategy: Pick one and then go through all the others, until you find one that rhymes. The strategy doesn't work. Maria thinks any similarity is a rhyme. The teacher says the words for her, asking her each time if it rhymes. Maria's answers are random. She depends on nonverbal (raised eyebrows, a questioning look) or verbal ("No?") cues to find out when she has erred. The teacher remains very solicitous and gentle in the

in the face of Maria's incompetence. She talks to both girls in the exaggerated tones that adults sometimes use with very small children. She stops the game when the scores are tied, and gives them a worksheet on beginning sounds. She explains it and watches as they do examples. Then she goes to her desk to grade papers. Panchita finishes quickly and gives the teacher her paper. "That was speedy," the teacher says with satisfaction. She grades it immediately as Panchita watches. Her score is good, and she is rewarded with praise, and a seal which she admires on the way back to her seat.

Maria continues working on hers. No one else seems to have anything in particular to do except Shane, who is rather slow, and hasn't finished his day's work. He complains about not being done, and the teacher encourages him with preachments: work hard, don't think about everything at once, do one thing at a time. "If you keep working like that," she promises, "I know your brain will get stronger." The teacher notices John, who is playing with his eraser. She shakes her head and says with a disgusted expression, "get busy." He works for a minute, but stops as soon as she looks away. The period will soon be over, and he has neither finished yesterday's work nor gone to reading.

Comments

The preceding narrative omits some features and scrambles some incidents, but I believe it presents a fairly accurate picture of the way students and teacher typically spent their reading time, and of the quality of the interaction in the classroom. The daily schedule varied little. From 8:30 to 8:50, the homeroom class did morning work, while the teacher often gave special help in math to Tim and Tom. During this period, the Genies read their story. At 8:40 or 8:45, the teacher invariably reminded the class to "get ready for reading," which meant that they should put their reading materials on the corner of their desks. At 8:50 or a little before, the change was effected, with some students going to different classrooms and others changing seats in their homeroom. The teacher said that she initially let students sit wherever they liked, and moved them later if there was a "problem" (e.g., a need to separate talkers).

The Genies were the first group to read. According to the teacher, none of them had been able to read at all at the beginning of the year. By the

time I observed them, Nathan and Tim already appeared to be handling competently the low-level materials they were given. Perhaps because she was furthest behind, Becky showed the most marked improvement over the course of the year. Though she never quite caught up with the boys, her sight vocabulary expanded considerably, as did her ability to use the phonetic hints and "rules for reading" given her by the teacher as prompts. The Genies' reading activities included work on initial sounds and vowel sounds; recognition, analysis, and meaning of vocabulary words; oral reading with attention to punctuation; discussion about the story (questions on content and its relation to personal experience); and worksheets for skills reinforcement. Their reading time was characterized by a freedom within limits. The teacher allowed, even encouraged, talking, but only within narrowly determined interstices in her lesson plan. Their discussions were initiated by the teacher, based on the story or vocabulary words, and were intended to pique their interest and involvement. To some extent they were successful, but the teacher was not skilled at tying the students' comments together or following-up on student leads to teach something new or make a point. Transitions between "talking" and "working" were usually abrupt.

Much the same pattern of activity was typical of the larger Star Wars group, with whom the teacher worked from 20 to 30 minutes, beginning anywhere from 9:15 to 9:30 or so. The Star Wars group did similar work: phonics worksheets and workbooks, vocabulary review, oral reading, questions on the story. It was pitched at a slightly higher level, and included more difficult tasks like identifying topic sentences and ordering sentences in a paragraph. The teacher was somewhat more likely to require "expression" in oral reading, and more apt to emphasize the "rules for reading" in phonics lessons. However, she said that she made a point of covering everything with the Genies that she did with the Star Wars, and saw to it that both groups were exposed to everything on "the continuum" whether it was in their books or not.

The continuum was an administratively determined set of reading skills that was deemed appropriate and desirable for second graders in the district. It was heavily slanted toward phonetic units. By contrast, the Harcourt Brace series recommended for off-level students was "light" on phonics. The teacher, who considered phonics extremely important, compensated by introducing phonetic rules and concepts herself and by supplementing their worksheets with her own phonics sheets.

The students had time in class to complete workbook or worksheet assignments. If the teacher was not working with another group, she was usually available to help individuals at their seats. Most often, this was at their initiative, indicated by the up-raised hand. Students rarely approached her when she was seated at her desk, and almost never when she was working with a group. If they raised their hands while she was working with a group, they waited patiently for her to notice them. Their requests were seldom for help, and such requests were deferred and handled when the teacher finished with the group. Typically, they wanted not help with work, but special permission--to go to the restroom, play a game, call their mothers when sick, etc. On the whole, there were remarkably few interruptions of the reading groups. The interruptions that did occur were of two kinds: management directives within the group, and pauses to give management directives or answer questions for students outside the group. In-group interruptions were most frequent for the Star Wars, reflecting the larger size of the group. It tended to get out of hand during the teacher's "free"-talking periods. Even so, I have only recorded 13 such interruptions in 11 observations. As noted in the narrative, Panchita and Maria were most likely to be interrupted by the teacher's responses to outsiders, despite the fact that there were only a few other students in the room at that time. This was probably because their reading group met toward the end of the period, usually from 10:00 to 10:15, when the remaining students were mostly finished with their work and doing extra activities that were relatively noisy, or trying to amuse themselves by talking or wandering around the room.

I have referred here, and above, to Panchita and Maria. Actually, Maria moved out of the district, and for most of the observation period, the teacher worked only with Panchita. I included in the narrative an example of her interaction with both to contrast it with her work with the other groups. She was much more creative with the two girls, and obviously put some thought into finding ways to make reading interesting for them. To some extent, this changed when Maria left, and her style with Panchita became a sort of on-to-one version of her techniques with the Genies. Panchita responded very well. Her main difficulties were when the teacher pursued a particular line of substantive questioning with a pre-determined ending. Panchita could never guess where it was supposed to be leading. The teacher had trouble posing questions that would inevitably yield the "correct" response, but she never adapted her style of inquiry to let Panchita find an "end"

more or less her own. Their "discussions" were usually characterized by fairly long leading questions from the teacher, and very brief monosyllabic responses from Panchita.

This teacher manifested a real concern for her students, but it was coupled with an equally large concern for self. More even than most teachers, she was apt to respond to students who rewarded her by reinforcing her image of herself as a good teacher and a slightly bizarre but fascinating character. She clearly wanted the observers to see her the same way. She expressed more initial concern than the other teachers about the videotaping and about observation schedules, and insisted that she be informed well in advance so she could get ready for us. During an interview, she wanted to know if her answers were what we wanted. More than once, she talked about the "strange things" she did to get students' interest, adding coyly, "I try to be good while you are here."

The "strange things" were often dramatic -- acting out a tug boat or a polar bear, for example. Note that it is the teacher who did the acting, not the students. A similar inversion occurred on the verbal level when she "discussed" stories with the groups. Many of her students loved to talk, and they would compete for the teacher's attention. But most often, it was the teacher who dominated, rather than guided, the discussion, telling them about her personal interests and experiences.

This teacher saw herself as very demanding, both in terms of academics and discipline. She felt that she was very strict, but she also joked with students (though sometimes at their expense) and claimed to like them and to enjoy teaching. From my observations, she was the kind of teacher who could be fun if you were on her good side, but horrible if you crossed her. Sometimes she seemed moody and almost arbitrary in her reactions to students, but there was a sort of wierd internal logic to her responses. Her rules were clear, even if her reactions (or over-reactions) to infractions were not always predictable. Usually it was obvious what you had to do to please her, but some students were incapable or unwilling, and class must have been a trial for them at times. For these unreachable students, the teacher had a ready rationale. She recognized that there were factors influencing school success or failure that were out of the students' control; but basically, she conveyed the belief that, if a student would listen to directions, pay attention, and try, there was no reason he or she couldn't do the work. Her

sanctions were the same for all: sarcasm, praise, seals, grades, privileges and their revocation. Motivation was something she more or less assumed, not something to be instilled. She was aware of individual differences to some extent, and said that she tried to find for each pupil a level of work that could be accomplished successfully. At the same time, she made few adjustments in her methods of teaching different students. She claimed to give less time for "decoding" to students with less reading ability, and to give a shorter amount to read to poor oral readers; but her practice was inconsistent. She was even more inflexible with regard to personal style, leaving it up to students to adjust to her rather than making an effort to adapt to their needs.

Appendix E

TEACHER 05

A "Typical" Morning with Teacher 05 (8:30 to 10:30 a.m.)

In teacher 05's room, the students' desk modules are arranged in rectangular tables that run perpendicular to the front of the room. The teacher's desk lies burdened with paper work, grade books, pencils, kleenex, an empty coffee can, and other assorted odds and ends. The table nearest it is referred to as "table 1." The middle table is "2," the far table, "3." Most of the 24 students in the homeroom class are seated on either side of one of the tables. A few are isolated at scattered individual desk units. Most of the students are Anglos. There are two Mexican American boys and one Black girl.

At various points around the room there are five stations, or "centers," that are focal points for weekly activities relating to "Language," "Math," "Your World," "Create," and "Listening." Today is Monday, and the center tasks are new. The teacher walks to each center and tells the class what to do there. Aside from this brief explanation, the teacher tries not to give too much help on center work. It is supposed to be independence training. They are to read the instructions and do the best they can. During the teacher's Monday explanations, they listen with interest. Some students speak out to clarify ("Do you have to color it?") or comment ("I hope I get to go there").

The teacher makes the circuit of centers and ends up back at the front of the room. She holds up several dittoed sheets and explains them, one after the other. She speaks in normal adult tones, her voice slightly raised, still conversational though business-like. The first worksheet is on contractions, and involves filling in "the letters we left out." Thor raises his hand. The teacher ignores him and finishes her explanation. Lynn speaks out, "I don't get it" -- not plaintively, but dubiously, almost accusingly, as if there were something fishy going on. The teacher repeats her explanation, elaborating a bit, and pointing to an example on the page. Then Chris speaks out: "I don't get it either." The teacher asks, "What do you not get?" and deals with his specific problem.

Her explanations of the rest of the "morning work" proceed the same way, with much questioning, speaking out, and conversations between students.

When she finishes, she assigns students to centers. Charles says loudly, "Where do I go?" The teacher gives him a stern look and says, "Charles, you never holler out like that." She passes out the worksheets. Students are supposed to begin work immediately, copying the handwriting example from the board, doing the worksheets, or going to their center. When the worksheets are all handed out, the teacher goes around again to staple them. As she passes by students, she comments on their work or behavior: "You don't need to be sharpening your pencil so much"; "Get busy. I want you to finish"; "That looks much better"; "Keep working until I get to you." When she is near, students speak out to show her their work or ask questions. Carrie relates a personal incident. The teacher is accepting but not encouraging. Like a psychiatrist, she merely nods and makes a noncommittal remark.

The teacher goes to her desk and begins filling out the attendance report. Several students come up with questions, and she stops to deal with each. One student sits at his desk with his hand raised, and the teacher gets up and goes to him. Her proximity seems to generate more questions, and she goes from table to table, helping students who speak out or raise their hands.

At 8:50, the classes change. Some of her students go to other teachers for reading, and some of theirs come to her. She has 26 students for reading. Eight of them are in the "accelerated" group, called Star Wars, that is the "highest" in the second grade. They began the year in the Economy second-semester second grade text and soon they are reading in the first-semester third grade basal. Her other 18 students are not as "high." They are the relatively slow ones, the "low average" group that is reading, with various amounts of effort, at the prescribed level for their grade in Economy's Mustard Seed Magic. The average students are divided into two groups: the Little Rascals and Close Encounters. The Little Rascals are slightly better readers, but the distinction is not rigid, and the teacher does not take too great care to maintain it. They do approximately the same work.

There is considerable bustle and talking during the transition period, as students find their places, vie for the teacher's attention, greet their friends, or comment on the assignment posted on the blackboard ("Gah, look how many pages we have to read!"). After a minute or two, they settle down,

as the teacher announces, "Your reading is on the board." Jeff continues goofing off. The teacher asks, "What should you be doing?" He replies, "working." She correct him, "reading." He insists on the last word: "That's working." He begins reading. The teacher encourages them by saying, ""We're going to be reading aloud in both groups today, so I want you to read your story very carefully."

She goes to her chair in the reading area. While the students read, she looks over the teacher's manual and her dittoed "reading work" for the day. Two or three students interrupt her with questions about morning work. She answers briefly, then stands to explain the centers to the newly arrived students from other homerooms, and gives them instructions and a "fun sheet" to do when their other work is completed. Chris wants to know, "Do we have to, if we're reading a book?" There is a Hardy Boys mystery on his desk. The teacher says, "Do this and then you can read your book." Finished with her routine business, she addresses her average students: "I want my Mustard Seed groups to look right up here." The vocabulary words are on the board. She tells them to read them to themselves before they will go over the words together.

It is about 9:05. Already several of the Star Wars have finished reading and are doing morning work or going to centers. They are very casual about their work, "cool" in their attitude toward the teacher and her rules. Heidi goes to the library shelf to get a book. She looks at one briefly and puts it back. She stands looking around a minute, then gets the coffee can from the teacher's desk and places it on her own. She leaves to go to the restroom, and returns the can to the teacher's desk when she gets back. Then she stands behind Julianne's desk and looks at what she's doing. They begin to talk. The teacher stops her work with the other groups long enough to say threateningly, "Heidi, Julianne, do you need some more worksheets?" They shake their heads and Heidi, looking put upon, sits down and begins coloring desultorily.

The Mustard Seed groups are going over the vocabulary words. The teacher asks a student to read a word she points out, and she follows with questions about it: What kind of word is it? What does it mean? Sometimes she mentions a sound or feature (like a suffix) and has them find a word that contains it. For instance, she says, "Give me a compound word. . . Brad." He answers "kitten." The teacher doesn't say "no" outright. Instead, she

questions, "Is kitten a compound word? What is a compound word?" Brad shrugs. Shaleza volunteers, "It has two syllables." As usual with incorrect responses, the teacher is accepting but demands more: "It can have two syllables, but what else does it have?" Tracy says "It's two little words, like 'cowboy.'" The teacher repeats her answer to them all, then makes a fist and taps gently on the top of Brad's skull: "Put that in your head and keep it there." He grins and mugs.

The teacher asks a question about every word. They refer to suffixes, prefixes, roots, plurals, meanings, and sounds. She points out a group of words with a common feature (the apostrophe) and asks "What kind of words are these?" A few hands go up. The teacher says demandingly, "Are these all the people who know?" She calls on Chris, who protests, "My hand wasn't up." "Don't you know?" she challenges. "No." She calls on others, but they don't know either. Chris raises his hand and gets another chance. He does know after all: contractions. The teacher says "very good" and lectures about contractions, asks them the "long form" of the contracted expressions.

She notices Charles working on something else. She reaches over and picks up the worksheets and says seriously, measuring each word, "Do not work on that while I'm explaining. Now you'll have to do it over." She crumples the paper and continues with the lesson. Charles does not pout. He raises his hand and is called on, and the teacher says "good" when he answers correctly. Neither seems annoyed with the other. It is as though the incident with the worksheet had never occurred.

After they have talked about the vocabulary words, the teacher says, "Let's see how fast y'all can say them. She points from one to another quickly, and the students sing out the words in rapid fire. Some of them almost shout. They seem to enjoy the noise and the challenge. It's like a game. Afterwards, the teacher holds up several worksheets for them to see. There is much squirming, yawning, and moaning as she explains them. Charles starts asking a question. The teacher says, "Wait. I'm not through yet." Damian raises his hand and says "I get it," and repeats her instructions in his rambling way. The teacher listens, nodding. Several students ask questions. The teacher goes to Tracy, who seems persistently puzzled, and points to the place on the paper as she explains. She stops to call the names of some of the Star Wars students at table 1: "Heidi. Bobby." She

goes to their table and leans forward slightly over them. In a low voice, she says seriously, almost pleadingly, "Y'all are going to have to do your work and get quiet." She places the palm of her hand lightly on the forehead of the student nearest her. The process of explaining takes about 10 minutes. Finally, she gets the worksheets handed out.

She goes to other tables to answer questions about them. Almost immediately, she calls out "Table 1 is getting just a little bit too loud." They quiet down, but only momentarily. The teacher ignores them, goes to the reading area, and looks over her materials. It is nearly 9:20.

In a few minutes, she calls for the Star Wars, with "only your reading books." Table 1 scrambles to the reading area. Two boys who were in isolated desks are also in Star Wars. Stephen is isolated in the reading area, just as he was in the classroom. The others sit in chairs, but he sits on the floor, near the teacher, facing the rest of the group. John is very slow to arrive. The others wait while he attempts to collect himself and his book. John makes the simplest tasks into major productions. Things seem to fly out of his hands, and he spends half his time leaning out of his desk to pick up something he's dropped. The teacher calls him again: "John, we're waiting." The other students seem more impatient with him than she. Jason calls out, "Your reading book, John," in disgusted tones. Finally, John clambers into a seat in the reading area. The teacher motions him down to the floor by Stephen, "right here. So you can see the board."

She goes in order around the group having them read their new words, questioning about sounds, meanings, and features as she did with the other groups. They answer correctly and receive little or no praise, except for John. With him, the teacher piles it on: "Good, excellent. Very good, John." After they go over the words, she has them begin reading the story aloud. She gives them only half her attention. From time to time, she looks over their worksheets or her manual, or scans the room for misbehavior. Stephen reads first. He reads competently, with only occasional hesitations that do not require corrective intervention from the teacher. Julianne is next. She reads very quickly, in a slight sing song as though she might be a bit bored. For his part, John clearly knows the words, but doesn't enunciate. He mutters them almost under his breath. The teacher criticizes him: His reading was inaudible, hard to understand, "run on," expressionless. The other students join in to corroborate, making remarks like "I could

hardly hear him." John seems frustrated by all the complaints. "Alright," he says impatiently when the teacher tells him to practice at home. "But my dog always bothers me." The others hoot. The teacher says merely, "That is not an excuse," and preaches to the group as a whole, "Y'all read silently very well, but you need to practice reading aloud."

Earlier, the teacher had moved Shawn over against the wall to work by himself on the floor. Now she pauses to reprimand him again: "You were moved there cause you were talking. Now you're talking to yourself. Keep your mouth closed." She turns her attention back to the group and calls on Carl to continue reading. John interrupts him to complain (as Carl had of him) that he can't hear him. The teacher puts the burden on John: "Well, listen." When Carl finishes, she critiques his reading, and again preaches to the whole group. "You're running your words together. Reading fast does not mean reading good. No matter how good you are, Julianne, you need to practice at home." The reading proceeds around the group, with occasional interruptions as the teacher calls the names of misbehaving students in the other groups.

When the story is over, she send the Star Wars to their seats to fetch their workbooks. While they get them, Carrie comes up to ask the teacher a question. She refuses to answer: "Not now. I'm busy."

When the Star Wars return, the teacher assigns workbook pages and worksheets. She has them read the instructions silently, then goes over them briefly. The students speak out to comment ("Oh, we've done this before"), complain ("I don't get it") or simply groan. The topics of the sheets are varied. One has to do with interpreting a bar graph summarizing information from the story they read. It is a new task, and it puzzles them. The teacher goes over and over the explanation, but they seem to resist understanding. Finally, she cuts them off, tells them to do the best they can. She concludes by admonishing them, "These are not easy pages. Take some time with them. Y'all are skipping over these workbook pages, trying to get out of your work." Charles intrudes with his paper in hand. The teacher turns to him and says, "Charles, do they interrupt your reading group?" The question is purely rhetorical, but Charles answers defensively--and truthfully--"Sometimes." The teacher denies it and sends him back to his seat.

She calls the Star Wars to her one at a time, giving each student his or her worksheets along with a word of warning, encouragement or advice. To

John, she says, "Work hard on these, o.k.? I want you to finish so you won't have to stay in from recess like you did yesterday." He seems to get upset, and complains of not feeling well and having too much to do. The teacher is unsympathetic: "Don' you start your whining. Everybody else has the same amount and they don't cry." She makes a vague threat about having to send him to Ms. _____'s room; in other words, move him to a lower group. He nods sullenly and goes to his desk. He looks through the work disinterestedly. One task catches his eye. It concerns writing directions about how to do something. He sits thinking a minute, then pulls his Cub Scout manual out from under his desk. He reads a while, seems lost in thought, then begins to write.

The teacher speaks to Charles: "I can answer your question now." He says, "I already got it" as hatefully as he can. The teacher gives him a look, lowering her eyebrows and pressing her lips together tightly. She gets up to help Carrie. Several other students ask questions, too.

At about 9:45, she calls the Little Rascals to the reading area. Cindy, Charles, Carrie, Cathy, Beau, Demian, and Jeff find their places. Charles is directed to the floor by the teacher. She asks some brief factual questions about the story -- who did what to whom, and so on. Then she has them begin reading it in unison. When their pace gets slow or their rhythm ragged, the teacher joins in for a few sentences. At the end of the page, she prompts, "Let's not slow down. Demian, I can't hear you too much." She reads with them a while longer, then stops. "O.k., good. Tracy, read the next page."

Tracy's reading is slow, halting. She stops to correct herself several times. Meanwhile, several of the Star Wars want to ask questions about the bar graph. Heidi is first, and the teacher deals with her quickly. Bobby and Chris follow. The teacher seems to realize that she made a mistake answering the first question. She shakes her head at Bobby and Chris. Bobby goes to his seat but Chris insists on asking his question anyway. Once it is asked, the teacher goes ahead and answers. She and Chris have their heads bent over the worksheet as Tracy reads laboriously on.

When Chris leaves, the teacher apologizes to Tracy and has her read part again. She comments, "You need to read more smoothly. Try to say more than one word at a time." When Tracy begins again, she has, if anything, more

trouble than before. Two or three others are asked to read aloud, until the story is finished. Then they talk about the main idea. The teacher lets them all answer, and tried to find something correct in what each says. She closes off the discussion by complimenting them on their reading and urging them to practice at home. Demian brags that he is reading a hard library book. The teacher agrees that silent reading is good, but "you need to read aloud, too. You need to hear how you sound." After about 15 minutes in the reading area, they are dismissed.

The next few minutes the teacher spends monitoring and answering questions. Someone in the class is humming. The teacher says, "Let's save the singing for recess." The room is fairly noisy. Part of it is talk, part the sound of movement as students turn in papers, get extra work or a library book, to to centers or the restroom. The teacher calls down individuals, separates Tracy and Nicole, sends Bobby out in the hall to work . . . all matter of factly, without real anger or personal vindictiveness.

Tracy comes up with a question. It is answered, but she raises her hand almost as soon as she gets to her seat. The teacher goes to her, gives her a questioning look. "I can't do this." The teacher frowns, "We just <u>did</u> it." Tracy smiles, looks at her paper, and says "I can't remember." The teacher says, "Well, think about it." Tracy gives her an imploring look, and the teacher stands behind her, leans over, and begins helping her with the worksheet. The teacher pauses to tell Demian, who sits nearby, "Let's finish before we start talking." She notices Nicole standing and says, "Work at your seat. Try to figure it out."

At about 10:00, the teacher calls the Close Encounters group: Jenny, Kelly, Bradley, TaShera, Shaleza, Kristi, Chris, and Shawn. While they get settled, the teacher "answers" another question for Chris. Actually, she simply encourages: "You can do it. The answers are there. Read what you put down." He leaves, smiling.

The teacher tells the group that they will read the story together. She'll read with them part of the time, but they are to continue if she stops. They read together, perhaps a little more hesitantly than the Little Rascals. During a pause, the teacher says, "Chris, Kristi, I don't hear you reading." They continue, not really in unison. The teacher stops to ask a question about what they just read. "Why was the turtle laughing? Kristi?" Kristi

stammers, falls silent. The teacher urges her, "Put yourself in the place of the turtle. You can say it." Kristi sits looking at her book. The teacher tries again: "You've been speaking out real good. What was so funny?" No response. Finally, she gives up and bails her out: "Was it the way they looked?" Kristi nods.

The teacher asks a few more questions, then calls on individuals to read. She is distracted four or five times by noise in the classroom. Several times, she calls out the offenders' names. The Close Encounters keep reading. At the end of the story, they talk about the main idea. The teacher accepts all their answers, however vague and off the wall. Then she lectures them about reading smoothly, with expression. They need to practice: "How many of you are reading at home?" Many raise their hands. She dismisses them at 10:25.

The teacher checks over the papers that have been turned in for the day. She calls Charles and says, "You didn't finish this." He says, "Aw, I can't." The teacher hands it back with an insistent look: "Can't never could." Christine is getting a library book. The teacher checks on her. "Did you finish everything?" She nods. "The fun sheet too? And color it?" Christine puts the book back and walks to her seat, looking disgusted.

The teacher announces, "Boys and girls, you still have a few more minutes. Let's try to finish up." She walks around the room, urging the slow ones on. To Beau, she says, "Work, work, work. You have a lot to do." To Tracy, "I can't believe you haven't finished that." She goes to check on John and discovers the Cub Scout book on his desk. She scolds him: "Don't you ever bring something to my room and work on it when you're supposed to be doing your reading sheets." She picks up the book and puts it on her desk. John protests, "That's mine." The teacher replies, "You'll get it back when you're finished." With a woebegone expression, he stares at the sheaf of papers on his desk.

Remarks

This teacher's routine is more variable than that of teacher 03 or 04. During ten observations, I saw several patterns. Sometimes she did as described in the narrative, first going over vocabular words and new assignments with her average groups for 15-20 minutes, having the Star Wars in the reading area next, followed by separate sessions with the Little Rascals and Close

Encounters. Other times, she took the Star Wars first, then the combined groups, again followed by Little Rascals and Close Encounters. On three occasions, she gave assignments to Star Wars and the combined groups and did not take the Little Rascals or Close Encounters to the reading area at all. On those days, all students spent the bulk of the period (about an hour) doing paper work at their seats.

Two general rules remained the same. One was that she tried to arrange for the other students to have enough work to keep them busy while she had a group in the reading ~~another~~ area. The second was that she always called her slightly slower group, Close Encounters, to the reading area last. This meant that her special time with them began between 9:45 and 10:15, and ~~lasted~~ ended anywhere between 10:00 and 10:30. She kept them in the reading area an average of five minutes longer than she kept the Little Rascals, even though their assignments were similar. This was probably in part because of the fact that the Close Encounters had more difficulties, and partly because the teacher was more likely to be distracted by outside interruptions that prolonged the lesson. One the average, the teacher had to correct or reprimand students in other groups about five times during each session with Close Encounters and only three times per session with the Little Rascals.

However, all the reading groups were exposed to fairly frequent interruptions. One reason for this may have been the teacher's vague rules about talking. She did not establish a rigid rule that students were not to talk at their desks. Her pronouncements about it, and her attitude toward it, was flexible. She would say things like, "Try to keep the talking down," "You're getting a little bit too loud," "You may talk quietly to yourself but not to your neighbor," or "Let's finish before we start talking." By giving them an inch, she was put in the position of constantly trying to keep them from taking a mile. When students crossed that fine line between acceptable and unacceptable levels of noise, the teacher's response was not very severe. She seldom seemed angry. More often, she seemed irritated, but her annoyance dissipated quickly. It was commonplace for students to be lectured, reprimanded several times during a period, moved to isolated spots, or even sent into the hall. It happened so often that both teacher and students seemed to look upon it as a matter of course. The teacher nagged, the students grumbled, but nobody really seemed too upset.

It may be that the presence of the Star Wars contributed to this atmosphere. These accelerated students were, on the whole, very out-going, self-assured, and independent. As obviously "good" students (in the sense of academic ability), they established a model making a certain degree of misbehavior acceptable (even prestigious) in the eyes of their "low average" classmates. It should be noted, however, that the converse was also true. John's behavior was so far out of line that he was in danger of becoming the "goat" for the whole class. Once he was marked that way, the others students began to discredit his academic ability. Several, in interviews, identified him as the worst reader in the class, even though he was in the accelerated group and actually read very well.

The reading groups were not only interrupted by reprimands to talkers. A more serious problem was the other students' persistence in asking the teacher questions about their work while she was "in a group." This practice was against an explicit rule, but it was one of those rules that is more "honored in the breach." The teacher was very inconsistent about enforcing it. She usually allowed interruptions for questions at "off moments," when a group was getting settled or finding a page, for example. But like the talking, this tended to get out of hand. It reached a peak in late winter, when the teacher's attention was often divided between the reading group and outside questioners, especially during oral reading. She seemed to realize that it had become a problem and made an effort at more stringent enforcement of the "no questions" rule in the spring. It is interesting that, during this period, she pretended that the rule had always been followed, by herself and by the students. She would reproach offenders by referring to a non-existent reciprocity between groups: "Do they interrupt your group?" They did, of course, but everyone except Charles acquiesced in the fiction that they didn't.

Teacher 05 seemed to be of the opinion that student "misbehavior" was actually normal and natural, not perverse or indicative of genuine "badness." She conveyed the impression that certain behaviors were not intrinsically wrong, only out of place in the classroom. In interviews, she was more likely than the other teachers to express the idea that certain actions were understandable and to be expected. For example, of Stephen (one of the misbehavers at an isolated desk), she said: "He just likes to talk. And he does have some interesting things to say. He's been in my social studies class

a few times and told me things I didn't even know. So you know, you like them to talk but there is a time" (5-3-79).

Her responses to students were fairly differentiated. In interviews, it was my impression that she used a larger variety of adjectives to describe individuals than did the other teachers: "smart," "hyper," "rude," "sweet," "friendly," "lazy," "shy," "withdrawn," "slow," "immature" (5-3-79). She seemed somewhat more flexible about adapting her personal style in dealing with these personality or ability differences. For instance, with Charles and Demian (two hard-headed, volatile boys), she tried to stay calm and patient. She said that getting angry only made them worse, so she tried to ~~read~~ reason with them instead (5-3-79). However, her attempts to deal with different students in different ways had their limits. She was not always successful. She tried several tactics with John: She nagged him, praised him, bargained with him, threatened him. Nothing was very effective.

She attributed John's problems to his home life -- something conveniently out of her control. But her failure to deal with him successfully casts light on certain underlying areas of inflexibility characteristic of this school generally. The teacher's goals for the different reading groups were institutionally defined, by the administration's reading "continuum," by the achievement tests, by "what they need for the next grade," and most of all, by the text. In this system, reading (as Jeff noted in the narrative) is "work." Reading work had two aspects: "skills" (basically phonics and language rules for the higher groups) and "reading" (basically, performance in oral reading, judged on criteria like smoothness and expression). The emphasis on "skills" and "reading" thus defined seems to have been the inevitable corollary of the emphasis on grading and standardized measurement. It was reinforced by the teacher's reliance on the convenient and administratively-approved objectives outlined in the basal texts. The upshot was that classroom activities were centered around visible and audible products. Silent reading for pleasure, which is essentially unmonitorable and not directly related to "skills," had the lowest priority of any officially sanctioned activity in the classroom. Even coloring the fun sheet was more important. Unfortunately, there was little in "reading work" that interested John, and the teacher was incapable of considering the possibility of using things he was interested in (like Cub Scouts) to teach the objectives she thought he needed. It was simply unthinkable, not to mention too much trouble.

Appendix F

CLASS PROFILE, TEACHER 06

Teacher 06 was a small Anglo woman in her ealy thirties with short dark hair worn in a curly frizz. She was hired six weeks into the school year when school personnel decided that the number of second grade students demanded a fourth teacher for the grade. She was given a classroom in a different wing of the school building and was assigned to teacher students of high average ability for reading.*

Ms. 06 had previously taught fifth grade in a different small school district. She had taken time off from teaching for the past two years to care for her daughter. Her return to teaching was marked by some difficulty which she discussed in interview 1. She was not used to second grade students and hadn't realized their dependence on teacher direction. Furthermore she was unacquainted with the material used in the reading class. Although most teachers are given their choice of basals, Teacher 06 was assigned the "Young American" series since it was the only series left in the bookroom. She expressed disappointment in this-finding the series full of dull stories. An additional disability was her physical isolation from the rest of the second grade team - the other three teachers have adjoining classrooms in a different wing of the school. Teacher 06 was unable to get the chance to observe others as much as she wanted. Her requests for assistance from the administration did not result in the support whe felt she needed to learn how to teach second graders. A major problem area in her instructional method according to her was her lack of experience planning for small reading group. Previously she had taught using large group techniques for homogeneous classes of students.

In discussing her goals and plans for her class Teacher 06 stressed that she wanted to see her students all on grade level by the end of the year. Her evaluation of progress was mostly based on examining student progress in oral reading, on progress through basals and on performance on written assignments.

* Her class consisted of 27 students. 16 males 11 females, with 6 Blacks, 12 Anglos & 9 Mexican-Americans.

Class profiel, Teacher 06 page two)

The classroom in which Teacher 06 taught was similar to classrooms used by the other teachers except that its outside door faced the courtyard and its back walls faced another wing of the school. Her room was located directly off the corridor going to the cafeteria, but her door was far enough away from the cafeteria so that the noise was minimal. In the beginning of the year the teacher located her desk in the front of the room nearest the outside door. Throughout the year the desk moved frequently - being located in the back and side of the room on several occassiona. On each observation student desk arrangement had also been changeAlthough the teacher maintained a pattern of keeping students within reading groups in close physical proximity to one another, she would often push desks together or apart to change peer groupings. She explained (Interview 2) that she often rearranged students every two weeks in attempts to separate students who were easily distracted from talkers, and to break up friendships which resulted in students' copying from one another. Sometimes an easily distracted student would have his desk moved to the front of the room away from all others; at other times that same student would be assigned to sit at the long table on which Teacher 06 often did her grading. She explained that at these times she felt the distractable stu-ent was working better with adult monitoring.

Teacher 06 differentiated her teaching style from the other teachers based on the student ability levels. She saw teacher 07 (high group) as encouraging more indepepdent work while she gave more direct instruction. She felt the low average group to be best taught with considerable skills instruction. She characterized her own style of teaching as a balance of skills instruction and monitoring of independent activity.

The teacher's instructional style was somewhat grating. She appeared tense most of the time. Her movements were somewhat rigid. Her voice had a slightly adenoidal quality. Although she smiled often, her smile seemed rather forced. She perceived herself as being rigid and self-conscious. She expressed surprise that she seemed less reigid on videotape.

(Class profile, teacher 06, page three)

Teacher 06 tolerated a wider variety of student behavior than other teachers on the team. Students were out of seats more frequently and were allowed to talk with one another. Teacher would frequently stop her instructional activities to regain student attention or order through use of various behavior gimmicks. She appeared to try to apply principles learned in teacher training institutions to encourage appropriate behavior. She tried to ignore inappropriate behavior and praise appropriate actions. Her techniques for motivating students to attend included encouraging competition between groups or sexes for being appropriate. She would say, "let me see which table is ready to line up first", or " I;m looking for people who are quiet"., frequently in attempts to have students respond. Other behavior techniques used included having students actively show readiness, "Raise your hands if you are ready" and actively attend to teacher, "I want all eyes on Ms. 06". She allowed students who demonstrated appropriate behavior to do jobs around the room such as handing out or picking up books or materials.

There were no clear cut rules in the classroom. It was difficult to tell whether students needed permission to leave their seats or whether students expected conseuqences for not completing work. Work load for students seemed somewhat less than in other classes so usually students were able to finish work quickly.

The daily reading class schedule changed more frequently than in other classes. Included in most class days was oral reading by reading group, spelling (using second grade speller), indepepdnent reading, written work and cursive writing on occassion. During reading teacher was assigned a title 1 aide who read with title 1 students. Teacher 06 criticized the aide program for a number of reasons. She felt that it was difficult to have a person in the room who was only able to work with a set group of students. She also resented the amount of time she had to spend planning for the aide who was unable to grade papers without a key and was expecting the teacher to tell her what to do on a daily basis. The aide was a stern looking older woman who was always neatly and formally dressed. It did not appear that the two woman got along very well together.

(Class profile, teacher 06 , page four)

Teacher had labelled the reading groups Group A,B, and C at the beginning of the school year but somewhere along the line switched the names to Group X,Y,and Z with Group Z being the high group. Groups were about even in size. The high group was the most animated and the most cohesive. Teacher appeared to prefer to work with this group. She was more informal with them and tended to be more able to match her explanations to their learning styles - her language was easily understood by these students. When working with the lower groups she used more games and gimmicks to aid concept learning. For instance she had the low group learn syllabification by having them close their eyes and put up the number of finger to reflect the number of syllables in a given word. When a child was wrong she would take his or her hand and change the number of fingers held up.

Teacher worked with small group for lengthy periods of time. She might sit with a group on the rug and listen to them read. During oral reading she appeared not to be very actively involved in the story content. Teacher 06 would write comprehension questions from a story on the front board and would go over these during the small group reading. When other types of written assignments were required she might go over to the small group where they were seated in the classroom and go over the task at hand. At times she would have the lowest reading group bring their chairs to the front of the classroom and would do phonetic drills using the front blackboard. Another instructional technique she used emphasized individualized teaching. She would call students up to her desk or to her chair either to listen to them read individually (an informal test) or to give them feedback on written assignments she was grading. During these small conferences she would give students feedback on how hard they were trying, on what types of problems they needed to work out and on the neatness of their work. Students usually left these conferences with pleased expressions on their faces.

When talking with individuals, small groups or the whole class the teacher used a consistent and distinctive speaking style. She referred to herself as "Ms (06)" rather than saying "I". She used the "we" term in discussing class activities. Although she used different language with different groups her tone of voice remained pleasant and distant most times. She rarely raised her voice and never spoke sharply or critically. Her voice is always a bit preoccupied. Only during break will she drop her formality and act relaxed with the students.

Teacher 06 clearly wanted her students to get through the work at hand. Her concern for content was low. Her interest in enabling students to generalize from the activities in reading was almost nonexistant. At times she would try to elicit student examples or student experiences in order to illustrate a concept at hand in the basal readers. Usually this action was suggested in the teacher's guide. Student comments were quickly cut off.

The predominant instructional style used in the classroom emphasized modelling rather than rule learning. The teacher would set up a pattern of response and illustrate it so that students could copy the pattern and get through their work. It was hard for this observer to ever clearly ascertain the rule or concept being taught at a given time. Student responses to teacher questions revealed that they often suffered from the same confusion (May observation 1).

The classroom was clearly teacher controlled. The teacher often complained about the burden of grading papers but she was reluctant to allow students to check their own or each other's work. She had difficulty setting up answer keys such that the aide could relieve her of some of the grading responsibilities since there were often no directions or answer keys in easy access. for her worksheets.

Class profile, teacher 06, page six)

ETHNOGRAPHER"S COMMENTS

The following pages provide brief glimpses into teacher 06's style and preferences in her reading class. She is just too boring to write about any further. Her class was the least enjoyable to sit through. It appeared that both she and her students were merely going through paces to complete work rather than getting any joy out of the process. At times the teacher would try to insert excitement into the class (witness the pen pal project, April observation 1). But for the most part no one really took the reading class as a serious or important pursuit. It is possible that the teacher being unfamiliar with second grade students had considerable difficulty discerning the appropriate expectations for her charges - she appeared to have very low expectations of student ability and interest. This teacher could have benefitted from learning her trade in an open classroom situation where she would have had contact with more enthusiastic models who were able to instill more interest and excitement into their task. It is doubtful that Teacher 06 will return to this job in the next school year - This observer could find no incentives for continuing such activity. She had to drive to work from Austin daily and had few reasons to be excited about the school. She had expressed disappointment in the administration in all conferences with observers.

Her lack of interest in her task contributed to the chaos in the classroom. Students who were friendly with one another had a good time despite the instructional demands in their day. They had time to visit and play because their work was so easy. At times they were given assignments which they had done before and the teacher asked them to do it again anyway. Students who needed more sturcture and attention sufferred in this class - notably Tremisa and Joyce, and Chad and Terry would had academic problems requirign more individiaulized teaching. The teacher should be commended for realizing her problem areas and asking for help; she should be pitied for the fact that she did not get any help in her district.

Interview
~~NARRATIVE~~ EXTRACTS TEACHER 06

CATEGORIES	EXAMPLES
TRUST:	
of students	lack of trust; they copy, talk, get too friendly with each other
of aides	lack of trust in judgement, competence: they need explicit directions, answer keys, lesson plans...must handle them right or admin. may be annoye
of self	lack of trust; need to know what other teachers are doing
of admin.	lack of trust..they evaluate without helping
HUMAN NATURE:	
children	smarter kids more independent...students sensitive to social/academic hierarchies (which classes are higher)...kids need to be taught independence. ...importance of peer relations..but gets in the way of students learning to work on their own.
INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS	
teaching	lower students need more "directed instruction", higher students can work indepepdently..being monitored. Middle kids need balance of "skills instruction" and "monitoring"
grading	teachers grade, not kids
material	prefers basals to Gusak...prefers Harper Row
grouping	prefers homogeneous large group..doesn't like to choreograph a few small groups
evaluations criteria	on grade level?
use of other resources	limited
SELF-PERCEPTION	
as teacher	rigid, self conscious, not use to second graders wants to know about others
as team member	team should stick together

NARRATIVE EXTRACTS TEACHER 06

INDIVIDUAL STYLE

Student preference	prefers Karen's group likes Gerrold individualizes who she will tolerate interruptions from problem kids: Chad, Scott, Tremisa, Joyce,
Teaching style	choral reading and answers unfamiliar with materials., esp. worksheets grades while monitoring a group prefers to work with students at a long table rather than at teacher desk inconsistent in having students bring chairs or sit on floors for small group instr. impersonal will attempt to elicit persona statements and then cut them off quickly uses board with small group voice changes: formal with instructions and beginning class informal during recess always a bit preoccupied stands in front of front board to teach has low group in rows along corridor, high group grouped together by wndows teacher retains control of info - her voice always carried the answer (may reiterate a child's) uses modelling and patterning for kids: sets up a pattern to be carried out rather than relying on a rule
Concern about work content	low
Expectations of students	low ("You didn't get finished, as usual", it;s natural to make mistakes")
Posture	Does use challenge statements to encourage work ebdns over students to help
Language	Talk about self in third person, uses "we" affect impersonal..talks differently to groups
Standards	No erasing (need to think carefully before writing down...kids thot it was to minimize messy papers

NARRATIVE EXTRACTS TEACHER o6

EXPLANATORY SYSTEMS

time	explains about yesterday, today, this week gives directions rooted in time gives step-by-step directions
content	directions re procedures (how to fold papers, line up, number papers, write answers, etc.) (such directions became scarcer as the year went on.
attention gimmicks	"raise your hand if you're ready" "let me see which table is ready" "all eyes on Ms. (06) "I'm looking for people who are quiet" (job) "You're supposed to be..."
written	Uses board for direct instruction, for writing chart work to be copied and done Writes on board during class time
cues for not understanding	uses same terms as in original explanation modelling

CLASSROOM CONTROL

tolerance	doesn't like giggling in small group, doesn't like kids out of seats.
techniques	limited monitoring...ignores alot sits close to group which tends to act up warning voice rearrange student seats prevention by encouraging "active" quiet people calls down one person in a group

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFECTS

rain	teachers make more active or involving inside act.
cold	students move less
end of year	kids slide by with more..pace increases

NARRATIVE EXTRACTS TEACHER 06

INDIVIDUAL STYLE

Student preference	prefers Karen's group likes Gerrold individualizes who she will tolerate interruptions from problem kids: Chad, Scott, Tremisa, Joyce,
Teaching style	choral reading and answers unfamiliar with materials., esp. worksheets grades while monitoring a group prefers to work with students at a long table rather than at teacher desk inconsistent in having students bring chairs or sit on floors for small group instr. impersonal will attempt to elicit persona statements and then cut them off quickly uses board with small group voice changes: formal with instructions and beginning class informal during recess always a bit preoccupied stands in front of front board to teach has low group in rows along corridor, high group grouped together by wndows teacher retains control of info - her voice always carried the answer (may reiterate a child's) uses modelling and patterning for kids: sets up a pattern to be carried out rather than relying on a rule
Concern about work content	low
Expectations of students	low ("You didn't get finished, as usual", it;s natural to make mistakes")
Posture	Does use challenge statements to encourage work ebdns over students to help
Language	Talk about self in third person, uses "we" affect impersonal..talks differently to groups
Standards	No erasing (need to think carefully before writing down...kids thot it was to minimize messy papers

NARRATIVE EXTRACTS TEACHER o6

EXPLANATORY SYSTEMS

time	explains about yesterday, today, this week gives directions rooted in time gives step-by-step directions
content	directions re procedures (how to fold papers, line up, number papers, write answers, etc.) (such directions became scarcer as the year went on.
attention gimmicks	"raise your hand if you're ready" "let me see which table is ready" "all eyes on Ms. (06) "I'm looking for people who are quiet" (job) "You're supposed to be..."
written	Uses board for direct instruction, for writing chart work to be copied and done Writes on board during class time
cues for not understanding	uses same terms as in original explanation modelling

CLASSROOM CONTROL

tolerance	doesn't like giggling in small group, doesn't like kids out of seats.
techniques	limited monitoring...ignores alot sits close to group which tends to act up warning voice rearrange student seats prevention by encouraging "active" quiet people calls down one person in a group

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFECTS

rain	teachers make more active or involving inside act.
cold	students move less
end of year	kids slide by with more..pace increases

Appendix G

CLASS PROFILE TEACHER 07

Class 07 is located in the front wing of the elementary schoo. It is the first second grade classroom on the corridor facing the street. In in Teacher 07 teaches the high ability students in the 2nd grade. She is a plesant looking Anglo female in her late thirties. She has short brown hair and is of medium height and weight. Ms. 07 is a teacher of 11 years experience - in second, first and speoial education classes. She has lived all her life in Taylor and is currently raising a family there. This is her second year teaching the high ability students in the second grade.

There are 29 students in the class - 18 male and 11 female, with 25 Anglos and 4 Blacks. These students are divided into four reading groups of varying sizes, with threestudents in the highest group and some8 or 9 in the other three groups. Groups are identified by the name of the book the students are currently reading from - thus names changed frequently over the school year.

The room in which class is conducted is a rectangluar classroom with the teacher's desk located in the front of the room near the outside door and close to the inside doorway which opens into Classroom 08. Students has permanent seats to which they were assigned. There was a long table in the front of the room close to the blackboard, a round table in front of the teacher's desk, a cluster of student desks pushed together on the corridor side of the room and a number of desks arranged in rows in the back of the room facing front. Various bulletin board displays were placed on the back side bulletin boards. The teacher had set up a small group reading area in the back of the room near the corridor. There was a blackboard lining the back wall and a stool for the teacher placed on the back corner of the reading rug. On the middle corner of the rug was a science table and a center where library books were displayed. Shelves for books were located in the back corner near the courtyard windows.

On the counter space neer the courtyard windows a variety of math and reading reinforcement materials were displayed. These

SRA and Barnell-Loft materials which were used frequently during the reading class.

The room arrangement allowed for limited extra space in which to move around. The teacher would write reading assignments by group on the blackboard in the front of the room. Charts used for written assignments were placed on the counters near the courtyard windows or in the back of the room. Students would often need to move from their seats to get in position for doing chart work.

In this room Teacher 07 monitors students as they learn basic phonetic concepts and improve reading and comprehension skills. The teacher sees her role as enabling students to advance one grade level in reading over the year. She uses the Houghton-Mifflin and Economy series to further her goals with her three average groups and documented moving her lowest group from a 2-1 reader through the 3-2 readers. For the highest reading group teacher used the Open Court and Scott-Foresman series moving students through a 3-2 basal to a grade 5 reader.

This teacher's instructional style emphasizes student independence. Each day she begins class with an explanation of the directions and work assigned each group. All groups listen to and participate in reading the directions. Daily assignments will be written on the blackboard for each group. During the direction-explanation time all students may do choral readings of the informstion on the charts that are assigned to different groups. The teacher explains that this is to enable students who finish early to do work assigned to other groups - seeing the chart work as skill reinforcement for all students in the class. Along with chart work, silent reading and group instruction students are assigned work from SRA cards and Barnell-Loft Specific Skills series. These assignments are given out and graded by student monitors - notably Sabrina and Lesha.

After work has been handed out the teacher will call up each group individually and hand out further written assignments. She will give out ditto papers, emphasizing "ladies first" and then go over the assignment with the group - requesting and receiving individual answers regarding the work at hand. Each group gets sent back to their seats to do their written assignments for the day. When the teacher has met briefly with each group she begins her small group instruction.

During small group instruction the teacher again sits on her stool in the back of the room. Students know to stop by the bookshelves and pick up readers on their way to small group instruction. The teacher usually starts with the lowest reading group and calls them back to the rug to work. There they sit indian style on the rug and open their books expectantly. The teacher will often start out the instruction with a mild joke or a question regarding students' personal lives (for instance asking about the weekend or complimenting a child on a pretty dress). After an informal and relzed exchange the group gets to work on the oral reading assignment for the day. ("Did anyone dream about spiders?"

Small group instruction usually consists of oral reading of the story being studied. Teacher uses her guide or her imagination to use the story as a basis for studying various phonetic and grammatical skills and for extending student's abilities in reading comprehension, making inferences and learning more about the world. She may interrupt a story about a garden to talk about gardening and flowers and vegetables. She may interrupt a story about medical activities to teach students how to read their own pulses. She will use the blackboard in increasing student's vocabulary and in studying variou- phonetic skills. The teacher will call on one person to read and may interrupt the person to ask comprehension questions. When a child has difficulty answering a question the teacher will give a variety of cues and prompts to enable the child to get the correct answer. She may have the child narrow his or her search for an answer...may rephrase the question slightly to give a larger clue or may give an outlandish answer to her own question in hopes of helpin g the child figure out what is right by hearing an example of what is a wrong answer. The teacher's technique

stresses that each child get a chance to work out the answer to the initial question. She will take her time to ensure that each child get this chance and will patiently explain to other's that this is the way things are done.

On a typical day the teacher will work with the lowest group from 9:35 through break time at 9:45, resuming with the group at 9:55. Aroung 10;10 she will meet with the next group and work with them until 10:35. She works with the third group from 10:35 to 10:50 and spends the last 10 minutes working with her highest group. Each group is run in a similar manner. However the teacher changes her vocabulary and increases the complexity of her questions and her language as she moves up her groups. She appears to actively enjoy working with her top students.

The high group works in a different basal series and towards the end of the school year was involved in doing indepepdnent research in the library. One can understand the teacher's preference for these students. She knows Chris Lee personally and has worked with him before. Both girls are among the most popular and attractive-looking in the classroom.

The reading class schedule rarely changes. When class time is limited the teacher condenses her time with each group. She always takes the groups in the same order. Students know what to expect, and indeed when the teacher is late returning from break students will often go ahead in reading group on their own. There is an example in the notes of Susan Brummet monitoring the group in oral reading on one such occassion.

While reading groups are going on students in their seats are expected to be completing their assigned written tasks. Students may consult one another for help. It is known that students do not interrupt teacher during reading group unless the reading group is involved in silent reading. At such times a number of students may approach the teacher and be helped to figure out a problem.

Most students are able to finish their assigned written work during the class period. In their free time they may do an extra chart or choose to get a book from the library table. On occassion some students go back to the science table to play with the microspoce.

The teacher uses a distinctive style in her instruction and monitoring of her class. Her voice is somewhat artificial - she talks in measured tones and enunciates distinctly. Her tone is business like but pleasant. She tends to be musical to the point of being sing-song at times. She uses large words and talks slowly. Her voice is compelling. When she tells a story her pitch rises and her animation reveals as much about the story as the words themselves. She has many ~~original~~ colorful lines which she uses in complimenting or chiding her class on behavior.; "You;re getting unglued at the seams"., "Just for the fun of it, let's read this", "You were monkeying around",. Her tone is always respectful of her students - however one always gets the feeling that she is reserving a major part of herself while interacting with the children. There is something unnatural about her tone and her affectations.

Teacher uses a variety of low key methods of praising and motivating students. Often she will identify one student as a positive example of good behavior or good reading and provide specific examples of what that student has done that was exemplary. She will then ask the students to evaluate themselves using the same criteria . When chiding class she will talk in generalities commenting that "there;s alot of buzzing at Katherine's table" or "Even on M-nday you can think". Students seem to want to please Teacher 07 and she usually will get immediate results with such techniques. When she needs to individually remind a student to behave she will quietly point her finger or call the child's name softly and shake her head. On rare occassions ~~On~~ ~~like~~ ~~heads~~ she will ring the bell on her desk. She may send a child to another seat if it appears that the child is having difficulty controlling his or her talking. On one occassion she cautioned the class to "zip it up" to reduce the noise level.

In the beginning of the year it wgs difficult for the observers not to get involved in the content of the reading classes. The teacher was able to make things exciting for her students. She knew the material backward and forward and rarely referred to her teacher's guide. However she was able to ask questions which were interesting. She often requested that students draw from their own experiences and feelings in examining issues in various stories. Her major concern was for students to learn how to draw inferences. Towards the end of the year she placed more emphasis on learning of phonics rules and expanding vocabulary. Her lessons were less animated and less interesting. Students stayed involved and clearly learned the concepts being taught. However observers were more easily distracted from the reading groups.

In teaching phonics and encouraging students to learn various word attack and vocabulary skills, the teacher utilized a wide variety of cues and prompts. When a student was able to figure out an answer she would often comment "Good thinking". Students in this class seemed to feel proud of themselves..they were often told they were smart and seemed to believe this. There was a sense of indendence and friendliness in the classroom. Students were willing to help one another. There was very little friction evidenced between students. No student stood out as being disruptive although Barbara took up alot of the teacher's time for her distractibility and her distractions.

The types of cues and prompts the teacher used are more typical of instructional styles in special education. She often used a Montessori style approach of showing a child the wrong answer in hoped that the child will learn though negative example how to think to get the appropriate answer. This type of modelling worked especially well with the low group - and with Tenitia, Katherine, Susan. Other prompting techniques included rephrasing a question as a fill-in-the-blank sentence so that a student could give a one word answer, pointing out to a student the location on an answer on a page, using a rhyme cue, giving a phonetic rule in a gimmick for as a reminder, narrowing a question, askign a child to draw from personal experience to answer a question.

She might ask a student to repeat the directions for a given question. Often she would encourage a child by saying "I know it;s hard but you can do it". When she worked with an individual student to answer one question many of the other students in the group would shoot up their hands to show that they knew the answer. It was clear that they wouldn't be called on. They rarely called out the answer. It appeared that this hand raising was a way that students could demonstrate their involvement in the class even while another child was being spotlighted.

Students were actively involved in class activities. They appeared to enjoy their work. They cheered when they finished a reader and seemed to enjoy the frequent change of names their groups were given. There was little competition between students. Students acted responsibly and independently most times, with the exception of Barbara who frequently needed considerable adult guidance. There was no aide working in this classroom, although the teacher did have the Title 1 aide in her room when teaching math to the lowest students prior to reading class.

The teacher appeared to enjoy her students - more so at the beginning of the year than at the end. Towards the end of the year she seemed more preoccupied. Her personal involvement with students was less visible. She tended to ask for one word answers in reading group and rarely developed discussions spinning off from story content. One problem with her teaching style involved her differentiation between girls and boys. In her rating scale responses she clearly had higher regard for her male students, although her female students tended to be more attracted to her. She often talked with the students as "ladies and gentlemen" and explained that ladies would get material first and that girls in dresses were allowed to sit in chairs during reading group. On other occassions she emphasized that "boys should know about wrestling" or some such comment reinforcing sex role stereotyping. Since so many of her students tended to model after her it seems that her tendency towards stereotyping might have destructive effects.

In general however, students appeared to profit from being in the 07 class. They progressed further in their skill development. They had more chance for taking on responsibility and learning to work independently. The teacher verbalized her high expectations of her students and thus encouraged many to work up to their potential. The differencein initial ability level between class 07 and class 06 may have been slight in the beginning of the year. By year's end the two classes were markedly different in attitude towards work, towards self and towards teacher and peers. Students in 07 seemed proud of themselves, their work, and their neighbors. Students in 06 were less interested in work-related standards and tended to take pride in athletics or spend time in social interaction unrelated to work.

Observer were always clear on the concept being taught at any given time in Class 07. Phonics rules were clearly stated and examples served to clarify any confusion resultant from the multitude of exceptions to rules in the english language. Students learned applied concepts related to story structure and thinking skills,

While students in 06 might share personal experiences with one another during class time, students in class 07 were given structured time to do so. Such experiences may have served to narrow the range of interpretation students can give to their experiences. Teacher 07 clearly directed value judgements about behaviors and stated her preferences and her feelings. Since so many students enjoyed modelling after her it is possible that discussion of personal experiences may have resulted in students adopting more stereotypic attitudes than students in 06 class.

ETHNOGRAPHER'S COMMENTS:

Teacher 07 stood out as an animated, respectful and competent instructor. She was more able to generate enthusiasm for work and to ensure that students learned the concepts being stressed. Her involvement and pleasantness were refreshing. In the beginning of the school year her ability to expand on topics made her class the most interesting to observe. Her variety of prompting techniques were impressive. It is probable that a careful observation of an early videotape would reveal a large quantity of prompting and cueing behaviors.

Over the school year Teacher 07 became less interesing to watch, Her approach came to seem more institutionalized and forced. Her value system was not consistent with the value system of the observer and often the observer would come away someone irritated by what she thought the students were learning about various social conventions.

Salient categories regarding Teacher 07 include

Respect for students	high
knowledge of material	high
Tone of voice	pleasant, distant, measured
Vocabulary	high level
Expectations for students	high
Chaos in classroom	low
Tolerance for interruptions	low
Clarity of behavioral norms	high
Enthusiasm	high
Creativity	medium
Questioning style	varied
Praise	medium
Disciplinary action	low
Personalizing of activities	high
Pace	fast
Teacher-control	high
Student pride	high
Student responsibility	high

Appendix H

CLASS PROFILE: TEACHER 08

Class 08 meets in a somewhat dark room which is located in the middle of the second grade cluster of three classrooms facing the street. The classroom is a crowded rectangular room with high windows facing the street side of the building and a row of waist high to ceiling windows facing the courtyard of the school. The courtyard side of the room is lined with waist high cabinets and a sink. On the counters of the cabinets stand a variety of instructional boxes such as Durrell-Murphy and SRA Schoolhouse reading kits. The street side of the room houses taller closets and shelf space. There is a blackboard lining the front of the room. In the back of the room there is a low set of stairs leading towards Class 07. In the space between the stairs and the courtyard wall the teacher has set up an area where puzzles and books are located. There is a dingy rug on the floor covering this space.

The teacher has her desk located in the front of the classroom to the right of the doorway close to the outside doorway leading into Class 09. Directly in front of her is a row of student desks. There is another row of desks near the street side of the classroom and a further group of desks in a square pattern in front of the rug area. In the front of the room there is a long table where the low group of students sit. In the front courtyard corner of the room there is a student desk on which sits a "Systems 80" machine - a large plastic object which looks like a computer terminal.

On the back courtyard corner of the room stands a wall heater painted red. Back walls are covered with various bulletin board materials which change throughout the year.

The room appears to be cluttered with student desks and materials. Desks are of the old design - wooden tops with space between top and bottom in which to place books and materials.

(Class profile 8, page two)

In this room, Teacher 08 works with those students who are lowest in reading ability in the second grade. She has 26 students, of whom 11 are female and 15 are male. Ethnic breakdown shows 11 blacks , 8 Meixcan-Americans, and 7 Anglos. Many students in the class are eligible and are given extra service through Title 1 reading and Special Education. The students who arein the lowest group in the class (those sitting around the long table in the front of the room) are often assisted by a Title 1 aide who enters the classroom during reading and joins the group. A number of students in the class have been retained in earlier years; a number will be retained at the end of this school year.

The teacher of this low class is a slim Anglo female in her late twenties or early thirties. She has short blond hair and is of medium hieght. She became pregnant in late fall and continued teaching throughout the school year. She is the team leader for the second grade. During the year she was involved in various duties related to her leadership role within the school district as well as being involved in pursuing bilingual certification with the rest of the second grade team. This is her fourth school district; she has taught second grade here for the past two years and taught first grade here the year before. A number of students in her class (Natasha L, Chris T.) she taught when they were in first grade. She is a community resident of Taylor. (taught low group last year also

Ms. 08 has explained that she sees her goal as getting all students in her class to be working in second grade readers before the end of the school year. To aid her in furthering this goal she uses a variety of materials and a stern teaching style.

Basal readers used in the class were chosen by the teacher from the set of readers adopted by the state. Ms. 08 uses Harper-Row series "because it an easy series". In addition, she is very familiar with the series - knowing the content of the stories (from using it last year) and the sequence of skills stressed, and having materials already duplicated for use in skill development. She has her class divided

into three reading group which are labelled 1, 2, and 3. Students are ability grouped with Group 1 students being in the highest reader and Group 3 being the small group sitting at the fron table.

Teacher 08 has definite views about the ways to teach reading. She stresses a phonetic approach with considerable emphasis on practicing oral reading. She talks about trying to make sure students read aloud every day - preferably two or three times a day. In addition Teacher 08 says that she has other instructional goals which stress students learning how to listen (she cites not- listening as the number one cause of problems in Interview 1), how to read directions amd how to work indepepdently. Her planning of instruction takes into account a belief that students should be doing work that is below their frustration level, but above their level of boredom. To ensure that students are working at the appropriate level she tries to continually ascertain ability and skill level through informal channels.

In discussing her approach to reading instruction Teacher 08 stresses that low level students need to be taught somewhat differently than higher level students. In addition to having academic problems, the Teacher feels that her students have more social, behavioral and home problems. This necessitates different treatment at school.

Above all else, the teacher feels that a firm and consistent approach to her students produces the best results. Her actions are consistent with her philosophy in that her teaching style is characterized by firmness and a no-nonsense approach. She talks about feeling strongly that everyone should learn to read - which is why she says she likes the challenge of teaching low students. She is dubious of the merit of special programs for low students- observing that they are more trouble than they may be worth. She feels strongly that cooperation from home goes a long way in aiding students.

Class profile Teacher 08, page four)

There are a number of general rules and expectations coloring activities. The teacher has a tendency to jump on children for small violations of informal rules such as not beginning work on time, not positioning oneself right at one's desk, not working neatly, not following procedural directions. There are a few formal rules such as staying seated during activities, returning materials on time and finishing work. These rules are strictly enforced, the punishment for transgression being loss of P.E. time. There is a place on the blackboard where a student writes his or her name when told to which denotes that they have lost P.E. privledge for the day. Usually the teacher will call to a child to write their name on the board and later on in the class period will come over to the child to explain the problem and chastise the child (see Stephanie, March Observation 2).

The teacher's posture and physical responses to students reinforces her no-nonsense approach to reading class. She moves briskly, arms crossed kepping her posture very erect. Her tone of voice is often critical and exasperated or irritated; her tone is considerably more pleasant when she works with the high ability math class. She monitors noise level closely, shaking a finger, calling a name or giving a warning glance to students whose voices are heard. Her phrases of warning and criticism stress that students should be listening and working. Some of her favorite phrases are "Get busy", "Wake up!", "You didn't listen!, and "You're finding out I mean business!". She will often grab a child roughly by the arm when they are misbehaving (i.e. talking to a neighbor).

Teacher 08 seems always on the edge, ready to find fault with a student. She appears to have a low level of trust, often accusing students of copying (see April-May observation 2). During seat work activities she walks around checking the written work of students who have problems beginning or carrying out work; she is much less likely to look at the work of capable students.

Reading instruction goes on between 9:15 and 11:00, during which time there is a consistent se q uence of activities followed. The class begins with spelling from 9:15-9:45. Following spelling they are expected to do individual reading which is to be done silently. At 9:55 the aide takes the students for a short break during which time they are to go to the rest room, get water and play either outside or inside if the weather is bad. Following the break the students return to their seats to continue silent reading and receive instructions by group for the written assignments that correspond to their basal work. The teacher calls students by groups to the carpet for reading group activities which go on for the rest of the reading period. Students who are not with either teacher or aide during reading group are expected to sit in their seats and complete their written assignment. Written assignments may consist of answering questions from the basal story which have been written on the blackboard, working on phonics skills by copying work from charts hanging in the room or by doing activities on mimeographed sheets. It is expected that students listen to the teacher when she gives initial directions regarding seat work. The teacher will not answer questions while she is working with a reading group on oral activities although she will respond to interruptions when she is sitting with the reading group while they are busy with silent reading activities. When students complete their written assignments they are expected to do independent work
The primary instructional co[illegible] reading [illegible]
spelling, giving direction[illegible] for writt[illegible]n
from the remedial kits on the counter (i.e. Durrell-Murphy) or from their individual folders.

The primary instructional components of the reading class are spelling, giving directions for written work and small group instruction in reading. Students are given grades (N for unsatisfactory, S for satisfactory, E for excellent) for written work and spelling work. She explains that she sets her grading scale at 100 and "if they perform above 70 they know enough to get an S or an E,"dependning on their initial skill level . On written work the teacher takes neatness into consideration as well as correctness of responses.

A typical reading class will see a student entering the 08 classroom from any one of the three doors. The majority of students come from Classroom 07 where they have been working on math. When students enter the classroom the teacher tells them to sit down and begin to head their paper. She and the aide are passing around paper and spelling books, although sometimes the teacher will ask students to pass out materials.* Students are to put their ~~headings~~ name & date on their paper and be prepared to listen when the teacher goes to the front of the class.

* This happened more during the fall than the spring

In the beginning of the school year most instructions regarding spelling were put on the frontblackboard. As the year progressed more and more of the instructions were conveyed through oral means alone. However the routine of spelling remained unchanged. The class worked together in spelling. Teacher and students went over the list of new words in some form of choral reading at the beginning of a unit. The words are listed in a brightly colored box on the top part of the first page of the spelling unit. Following the list of words are a collection of written excercises to reinforce the spelling rule emphasized in the unit. Teacher and students together go over the directions for these assignments - doing one assignment at a time. The teacher will ask for individual or choral responses to the questions or blank sentence spaces in the assignment. Her choice of choral or individual response patterns seemed to depend on the complexity of of the lesson, but more often was somewhat random a choice.*

* when students answer individually teacher will amplify a correct response. She may make a face when a student gives an incorrect response. Following an incorrect response she may ask another child for the answer or rephrase the question to the original respondent. Teacher makes use of phonics & context cues frequently ("rhymes with" "it means —

After an assignment had been gone over by the whole class students were expected to complete the same assignment individually in written form on the paper they had headed. Teacher would give them time to work on the assignment and then go around to check work. Students at the front table were given help in beginning and completeing this work by the Title 1 aide who was very similay to the teacher in style of instruction, correction and feedback.

As the teacher walked around she would straighten students' desks,

(Class profile, Teacher 08, page seven)

As the teacher briskly walked around she would be picking things up off floor or straighten students' desks, papers, and seating or writing position. She had her grading pencil out and would indicate by a check if a student completed an assignment correctly. However when a student got something wrong she would sternly point out the problem to the student. Students would need to write their assignment again if they had neglected to skip lines in the appropriate way outlined earlier by the teacher. When they had written an answer wrong they were tp erase the answer and write the correct one on the space left. Teacher would not usually give the correct answer but would be very exasperated if the student got the answer wrong a second time. Her comments when a student got a wrong answer would emphasize that the student had not listened to the oral activity.

Spelling units are done on a weekly basis. The above description reflects an early week activity. Students are expected to stu dy their words in preparation for a practice test on Wednesday. Students who do well on the practice test (i.e. make an E) are allowed to play with puzzles during the regular Friday test. During the Wednesday spelling period students are given some time to study their words and then are given the spelling test, with the teacher walking around, book in hand, reading spelling wordsa and giving them in a sentence. Students use cover sheets to minimize copying Students pass in their spelling papers and are expected to do independent work while teacher grades the tests and hands them back with praise or critical comments. By the end of the spelling period it is clear which students did well and which did not. Students recieving Es can go do puzzles on the rug; Those who made S'es on the practice test are then can read a library book to copy their words over three times. those who make n"s copy their words till the spelling period is ended.

Spelling seemed to be a highly stressful period, especially during the work days when students are apt to be criticized for doinng their wrirten assignment inappropriately. Often the speller i is misleading. A student must rely on memory to ensure that he or she do the written work in accordance with the oral answers. If he or she gets something wrong, he or she must be a careful

eraser so as not to further incure teacher criticism by having a messy paper. Furthermore it is often difficult to figure out what to do upon being told that one's answer is wrong. Teacher feedback is not sifficient to enable one to immediately put down the right answer. She will explain that something is not right and give sometimes vague clues on how to fix answer. Her method of cuing for correcting is general, rather than reflective of an individual student's learning style. Often she will tell a student that he or she has a wrong answer and rather than helping the student figure out the problem she will harangue the student for being absent too much (Frank M.,,), for not listening or for fooling around. When the aide is free she will also go around checking work.

Following spelling the teacher begins to pick up papers which are correct and have been graded and to pass out readers. Students follow spelling with a short time doing "silent reading". During this activity students are expected to be reading over stories they have previously studied. Although the teacher often reminds students that silent reading means "Mouths closed" many students sub-vocalize (sometimes rather loudly) during this activity. Silent reading continues until break and for a brief period of time after break, during which the aide is in the room waiting for the teacher to return from the lounge.

The break is a short time when the teacher gets a chance to leave* the classrooms and the students get a chance to get water or go to the restroom. On nice days students are allowed to play for a few minutes on the playground. In bad weather, students may return to the classroom to play an aide directed game or to do escercises on the rug in time to excercise music played on the record player.

* Students are given instructions by teacher on how to leave materials & are called to line up by sex or by reading group

When the teacher returns from her break small group reading instruction begins. Students are given seat work to do while reading groups are called to the rug by the teacher. During reading time the aide often is walking around being available to students having questions. She is likely to be at the teac her's desk grading papers or reading with her small group if time permits.

For small group instruction the teacher will call a reading group to the back of the room to sit on the rug. Usually the teacher sits in a chair and the students are expected to sit Indian style on the rug with their books in their laps. Reading group usually entails students reading aloud individually. Teacher will usually help a student who stumbles on a word by giving them the word Students who are not having a turn are expected to keep up with the text by keeping their finger under the sentence being read. The teacher calls on students randomly to read. She has explained that if a student will get a zero if he does not know the place when he is called on to read. During individual reading the teacher may stop on occassion to ask students comprehension questions based on the story. These questions come from the teacher's guide which the teacher uses when doing small group instruction. * Teacher asks questions at the end of a page, not at the end of an idea or a reading turn

The focus for small group instruction seems to be on ensuring that students get a chance to read aloud. At times the teache will leave the group during a student reading and call a correction from across the room. Students are expected to have studied the story so as to read smoother. Teacher does not give very much individual feedback either of a positive or negative nature during the reading aloud. However she will comment on the performance of the group as a whole following the activity- either complimenting the group on reading and moving quickly or chastising the group for not studying. Typical comments include "You all did a good job reading the story" or "I'm really ashamed of how you did"(see Dec-Jan, notes Observation 2).

During small group instruction time students at their seats are doing a variety of skill reinforcement activities as outlined at the beginning of the class period. When they have complete their work they are expected to work on folder sheets or on Durrell Murphy material which they pick up from the side counter. At times a line will form in front of the Durrell-Murphy kit. There is a rule that only two people may be up there at a time and on occasion this rule is firmly enforced. During such

times a game will ensue between students who sit on the edge of their seats ready to jump up and beat someone else into the line when an opening becomes available.

The end of the period trails off at 11:00. There is not a formal closing of class. Students again line up to return to homerooms although some are instructed to stay to finish work.

On the whole the reading class is a very businesslike time, during which a specific quantity of work is accomplished. It is not immediately apparent to observers what specific skills are being taught at any one particular time to any one particular group. There is a heavy emphasis on drill work, on studying spelling words and on practising reading. The teacher creates an atmosphere which is somewhat formal and considerably demanding of student conformance to teacher rules. Teacher does slightly change her style and expectations on special days. For instance she encouraged good work on Valentine's day by giving out small candy hearts for completed work. When she feels a student is having a bad day because of problems brought from home she will give more attention and be more prone to smile or say "good" when they have done something well. Her praise is very meagre. Students do not seem to be working for praise, although they appear proud of accomplishments such as good grades on spelling tests. The teacher makes it clear that students are responsible for their performance - that it is their fault for not listening or studying when they get things wrong (rather than taking a position that a student didn't understand or that the teacher didn't make something clear). There appears to be low trust of students - they are accused of cheating or not trying very frequently. The teacher prefers some students over others (notably likes Chris A and dislikes Chris T) and tends to ignore those students who do their work and get by (Brooke).

Ethnographer's comments:

This teacher stands out as an especially punitive and anxious individual who may do more harm than good in the classrooms. She tends not to be personal with her students - is cold, aloof and critical of them. Her interactions in the social realm with students are almost nonexistant. When interacting on academic basis she does not seem sensitive to students having individual styles of learning and understanding. Although she expresses interest in teaching low ability students she makes no attempt to be individualized in helping these students learn how to learn. Her prompting techniques are very narrow and she does not give differential prompts based on the type of student or type of mistake made. Her teaching style reflects very traditional teaching - she appears to teach as she was taught in grade school. There are no innovative techniques or materials visible in her instructional day.

Her firmness may reflect a clear dislike of her job and of her students. She is ready to jump on any student for any little indiscretion. She rarely appears pleased with anything and only appears calm when ordering a hamburger from the aide who comes in to take orders.

Salient categories which differentiate this teacher from the ideal or normal teacher include;

amount of inner tension	high
ability to use miscue analysis	low
innovation	low
flexibility	low
pleasantness	low
concern with neatness and order	high
liking of students	low
efficiency	high
use of punishment	high
supportiveness	low
trust of students	low
noise level	low
learning in classroom	low

Appendix I

CLASS PROFILE: TEACHER 09

Teacher 09 is a small but sturdy Mexican-American female in her late twenties or early thirties. She teaches the "second to lowest" class of second graders in a small school district north of Austin. Her class meets in an old brick one story school building which is built as a series of long lines of classrooms all having doors which open to the outside. Class 09 is located at the end of the first such corridor which faces the street. This wing of the school also houses two other second grade classrooms, the principals office, the work room and the special classrooms. Class 09 is closest to the playground at the end of the school year.

The classroom is physically connected to the other two second grade classrooms on the wing. Teacher 09 has located her desk near the doorway which enters into class 08, thus having her desk at the back of her room. Students coming into class 09 enter through the outside door near the playground or through the 08 doorway. Desks in the room face many directions but the predominant sense is that the "front" of the room is near the playground. It is from this area that the teacher gives most of her verbal instructions and does most board writing.

The classroom is set up with clusters of desks put together. There is a grouping of four desks spaced apart and facing the courtyard windows near the outside door. Moving toward the back of the room there is a cluster of four desks pushed together where four students sit facing each other. There are a few desks spaced as rows farther back on this line. On the other side of the room there are again two sets of desks either grouped or pushed together and a few isolated desks in rows. In back of the teachers desk there is one isolated student desk nestled near the heating unit. In the middle of the room lies one more cluster of four desks pushed together.

Walls of the room are covered with teacher made bulletin board materials emphasizing phonics or Spanish or seasonal activities.

There is a small piece of carpet in the front of the room close to the windows facing the courtyard. There is a front blackboard. The teacher has positioned various charts on the cabinets in front of the courtyard windows. Closets on the street side of the room are used for lunch boxes and text books.

The way this classroom is set up there is no specific center of attention. Teacher's desk being in the back of the room creates a feeling that students are working independently. Students are seated in a somewhat haphazard manner although students in different reading groups began the year staying in physical proximity to one another.

Teacher 09 teaches 26 students; 10 females and 16 males. She has 6 MexicanOAmerican students (two pairs of siblings), 11 Anglo students and 9 Black students. This class is technically the low average class, in a second grade which is homogeneously grouped by reading ability level into four reading groups. The teacher uses the Harper-Row series with a collection of supplementary materials from SRA and Durrell Murphy to teach reading. Her emphasis is on having each student advance one grade level in reading. Her criteria for success is based on comparing student initial ability level (from objective cards in permanent record files) to reading level at the end of the school year.

This is Teacher 09's third year here and she considers that she is still learning her trade. She expresses that she enjoys getting advice from experienced teachers, and that she is interested in expanding her instructional methods at some time to include learning centers.

At present her instructional style is somewhat conservative. She teaches reading during the 9;15 to 11;00 time using the same sequence of instruction utilized by teacher 08. In fact there was an occassion where both teachers had been teaching the same spelling lesson at the same time and a student in class 09

was able to finish his written work in lightning speed by copying down the answers he was hearing teacher 08 read out in the next room (Febr. observation 1).

Although Teacher 09 has a similar schedule to teacher 08, instructional style and approach to students differ considerably. Teacher 09 talks about liking to see her students happy. She sees herself as prefering to work with students who are willing to work. When rating students and discussing studeht work habits it is clear that teacher 09 highly values student traits of dependability, application to work, neat and careful work, and ability to busy oneself and keep out of trouble. She is tolerant of talking during class periods but is clear about wanting to see students complete assignments.

Teacher 09 sets daily, weekly, and yearly goals and plans her lessons accordly. She states that she plans small group instruction so that students go through a story in the basal every three to four days. Her procedure for going through a story is to begin students in the story by having them read it silent. Then the reading group reads the story aloud and answers comprehension questions orally. The lesson is complete when students have answered the written questions that are outlined in the teacher's guide. Again, the year goal is for the group to have advanced one grade level (i.e. have completed two basals during the year). Spelling is set up on a weekly basis. In the speller there are four written excercises for each unit. The teacher plans to do one excercise a day. Students are expected to learn 10-11 words per week and are given a test on their words at the end of the week. At the beginning of the week they write their spelling words on a piece of paper and are expected to bring this paper home so that they can study their words with their parents during the week. In addition to going over spelling words teacher helps students go over new vocabulary words from the readers on a daily basis. She believes in the usefulness of extending a sight word vocabulary.

Class profile, teacher 09, page four)

Students come in to reading class at 9:15. During the early part of the school year they would wait outside until called in. By spring term however they would usually just straggle in and teacher would allow talking and visiting for the first few minutes of class. She was strict about having students walk to class and would send a student back if she saw that he ran. Most students came from class 06 which was held at another part of the building. Thus on cold days studpnts would come in with their coats on and it would take a little time for them to settle down.

Upon coming in and settling down students were anticipating spelling. Teacher would hand out papers for written work and a designated student monitor would hand out spelling books. The teacher would go over the lesson at hand and the whole class would participate in learning and reading the new spelling words and figuring out how to go about the written exercises at hand. Usually the teacher would have students give answers to spelling assignments and let the students do the assignments in writing following oral explanation. By the middle of the year she and the class were going over the entire group of written assignments orally before students put anything in writing. Usually directions and oral question answering would be completed by 9;30 and students would embark on their written tasks at this time. While students were writing the teacher and aide would be walking around checking work and helping students with their task. Usually the teacher would be ~~very helpful in her checking~~. ~~She would~~ encourage a student to think about ~~an answer~~ and find the correct answer (when a student had written down a wrong answer) by explaining the mistake and giving cues for finding the correct answer. Students expected the teacher to be coming around to talk to individuals. She would give praise to students who were working and getting answers correct, would use a miscue analysis format for helping students having difficulties and would be sharp with

those students who were slow in starting. When a student would come up to the teacher for assistance the teacher would most often respond. However, on occassion when this sort of behavior became a pattern she would gently chastise the class for "following her around" and the norm of her walking and students staying seated would again predominate.

When it became apparent through student mistakes that a certain concept was unclear, the teacher would call attention to the whole class and try to clear up the issue at hand. At times the teacher would modify or change an assignment when students showed that it was difficult or when it became clear that students were taking too long on a task. She would shorten a task or extent the time limit or change directions so that the task would fit into her schedule.

Usually the teacher planned class so that students were finishing spelling by 10;00. At that time Title 1 students were leaving for special reading. Students took a 10 minute break from 10'10 to 10:20 most days. They returned to small group and seat work reading. At 10:20 or thereabouts the teacher would go over seat work directions with each reading group. By 10:25 students were beginning their seat work and the teacher would begin to call students by reading group to work with her in small group instruction. Usually each group got a chance to meet individually with the teacher and read aloud. During the last half hour the aide would also be in taking a reading group either to the carpet or to a spot in front of the teacher's desk and listen to them read. Sometimes the teacher would use the carpeted area for reading. Other times she would use the spot in front of her desk and call students to bring their chairs to read there. During small group instruction both teacher and aide listened to students read, calling on students in a random manner. Both would ask students questions from the teacher's guide. By 10:55 all groups had met either with teacher or aide or both and students were all back in their seats with teacher and aide checking or collecting seat work. Students closed their reading class at 11:00 and went back to homeroom.

(Class profile, teacher 09, page six)
"

Reading class is conducted in an orderly manner. Students appear to know the routine and make transitions easily and quickly from one activity to the next. Reading with the aide is somewhat less formal an activity than reading with the teacher. Students often are lying down or squirming on the rug and are more apt to lose their place when with the aide. When with the teacher they are more careful of their posture and know that they must keep their place or risk getting a zero grade for their oral reading.

Students are placed in either Group 1,2, or 3. There were relatively few grouping changes during the school year. Group 1 students are of lowest ability and Group 3 students are in highest books.

There is a low key and orderly tone pervading this reading class. The teacher uses a low and melodic voice in giving instructions. Her voice is very non-committal when disciplining students. She will call a student by first and last name when warning him or her to be quieter or get busy. She may use one student as a negative example to inspire others to be appropriate. When students talk too much or stand out as disruptive they may be warned once. If they continue they are told to stand in the corner near the file cabinet or are directed to change their seat. Apparently such a consequence also incurs a statement sent to the office where all offical disciplining is done.

It is clear from the teacher's tone of voice and her follow-through on warnings that she will not tolerate inappropriate behavior. However she tolerates a wider range of noise and movement than many teachers. Students being grouped together in seating often talk with each other and joke around or tease one another. They often copy from others' papers. The teacher allows much of this to happen and does not seem bothered by the low hum or movement in the classroom. She

does discourage copying and distracting by moving students who are prone to this behavior. These students ended up at the end of the school year in isolated desks.

Teacher 09 is the only certified bilingual teacher on the second grade team. The other teachers are all in school to get certification. Although there are no Spanish dominant students in the grade Teacher 09 does do some bilingual instruction. No Spanish was hear during the reading classes, although some Spanish syntax did frequently dominate Teacher 09's speech.

One of the most striking thingd about Teacher 09's instructional style was her ability to individualize cuing and prompting techniques to help each child learn from his or her mistakes. She would often ask a child why he or she gave a particular response and use the answer to help guide the child to think along a different line to reach the appropriate answer. Her instructional technique emphasized problem-solving by student and teacher. Often she would use these individualized cues while doing a whole group oral lesson. She almost always used individualized prompting when walking around the room checking written assignments.

The teacher would explain her own reasoning when telling students why something should be done. She explained clearly to the class why books should not be written on. Her explanation of why to learn spelling (" You spell things right because if you don't the word will mean something other than what you meant it to mean") seemed eminently reasonable.When she would change schedules or assignments she was careful to explain her reasons. Such comments seemed to model thinking and problem-solving for students..

(Class profile, teacher 09, page eight)

Although the teacher ratings of her students suggested an egalitarian attitude towards the class, the teacher indeed had some favorite students who benefitted from her attentions and had some students who she tended to ignore or be irritated by. Interestly, the aide seemed to share these likes and dislikes and responded to students in the same manner as the teacher. Both adults had difficulties with Padriac and Paul. They tended to harp on Paul for being slow and bumbling. Often both adults would descend on him to criticize his sloppy or messy work and to tell him to get busy. Padraic inspired a different type of antagonism. The aide might tease him for getting angry and then he would get angry. He would try to tease back and would then be disciplined. The teacher would reinforce this pattern.

Both adults would keep a close watch on Bobby, a student who had difficulty getting started and often used his going out for Title 1 reading as an excuse to stop work quickly or not get started at all. Teacher 09 tended to ignore Brooke, to the point of forgetting her name in mid year. There are some interesting social patterns in this classroom. There are two sets of siblings. Jimmy and Magdalena Reyes are both in the lowest reading group. Jimmy, although younger is brighter. Magdalena is somewhat domineering and protective of her brother, making sure he does his work and doesn't fool around. She tends to plod through things but tries real hard. Meggy and Peggy are also siblings, with Meggy being thwe younger, smarter and more domineering of the two. Peggy is a year older and is a shy and slow child. Meggy makes sure Peggy does her work but tends to hang around with a different group of students.

There is a small group of students in the Group 3 reading group who enjoy each other's company and tend to be more social. This group includes Meggy, Temple, Jason, Jerry, At one point they were all seated

tog-ther but that was changes in mid-winter. By March, friendship patterns were more differentiated although the effects of seating changes could be seen. Temple was becoming friendly will Stella and Jason had latched onto Brooke and Lori for academic assistance rather than copying from Temple constantly.

(INSERT, PAGE SEVEN)

The teacher allows for student individuality to emerge in other areas. She may suggest that students number their papapers "in rows or columns". When telling students to take papers home she suggests a variety of "special places" to keep papers (November Observation 2). She may give a student permission to change seats for a day (February observation,1). Although she does not encourage very much personal discussion she will on occassion use students as references to illustrate cercepts which come up in stories. Her tone is friendly but formal and somewhat distant from the students. She will smile and give physical support for students but most of her personal sharing of herself and full laughter is with the aide or the observers in the classroom. Her demeanor and attitude towards her students suggests that she is looking after them and encouraging them to learn tov think in a safe environment.

ETHNOGRAPHER'S COMMENTS

This teacher stands out as the least harmful of the teachers obsered. She clearly respects her students and tries hard to encourage each one to further their skills. Her style of teaching stresses thinking and provides a model for logical reasoning about academics and school in general. Her friendly but distant demeanor provides a sense of safety for students. She appears to know what she is doing and to be competent in getting across concepts to students. Her accent and grammar at times is very much off, but it doesn't seem to adversely affect her teaching or her students.

Salient categories which differentiate this teacher include :

Explaining behavior....	high
Being consistent	high
Enforcing consequences	high
Respect for students	high
Utilizing mistakes for learning	high
Personalizing (being a friend to students)	low
formality	high
flexibility	high
pleasantness	high
efficiency	high
learning in classroom	high
Use of self as model	good
Discipline	isolation
innovation	low
supportiveness	high
animation level	low